# Independencie A Great SCHISM PROVED Against Dr. OWEN his APOLOGY in his Treat of SCHISM.

As also an APPENDIX to the former Discourse, shewing the inconstancy of the Dr. and the inconsistency of his former and present OPINIONS.

By D. Cawdrey Preacher of the Word at Billing Magn, in Northampronshire.

LONDON,
Printed by J. G. for John Wright at the Kings-Head in the Old-Baily. 1657.

# Independencie

A Great

# SCHISM

PROVED

Against Dr. OWEN

in his INDULGENCE to SCHISM.

LONDON,

Printed by J. S. for John Wright at the King's-Head in the Old-Bailey. 1673.

# Independencie A great SCHISME.

## CHAP. I.

*By way of Preface.*

THE Crime of *Schism*, is so §. 1.
*heinous* in it self (as his own, and other's *aggravations* of it hereafter, will make good) and so dangerous and *noxious* to the Church of God, (as the event in all Ages hath declared); that no *Invectives* against the *evils* of it, can well be too great or high. No wonder then, if all men, of any perswasion, speaking of this Subject do make their *entrance* at this door: The *Ancients* (and latter *Divines*) agreeing generally in the *Notion* of *Schism*, and never changed, till now.

for their *mistakes* therein, had indeed the the *Happinesse* to deal with men *evidently guilty* of many *Miscarriages*, as in other things, so for their *Schismatical principles*: which being taken up, and *espoused*, by some in after-ages, have justly branded them with the *crime* and character of *Schism*. I shall instance in the *Donatists* (the first in *stories*, charged with it, as I remember) whose prime *principles* (for they took up more in after times) were these two, 1. "That they "were the onely Church of Christ, in a "corner of Africa, and left no Churches "in the world, but their own. 2. That "none were truly baptized, or entered "members of the Church of Christ, but "by some Minister of their partie. The Romanists, (as soon as *Antichrist* took the throne) have impropriated and stourly managed these very *Principles*. They first assume to themselves, the name of the *Church*, excluding all, that are not (as they speak to contradiction) of the *Romane Catholicke* belief. And then, that none are truly *Ordained Ministers*, but by their *Bishops*; and consequently none are truely baptized, or *members*, but those admitted by men, so ordained. These very *principles* are again

*improved*

improved by men of other *perswasions* (whom I yet name not); and whether our *Reverend Author*, will acknowledg them to be *Schismatical* principles, or no, I do not know; But this I know, that all protestant reformed Churches at home and abroad (besides those of his *constitution*) do hold them so to be. And thereupon (if he desired not to be singular) he might give up the *nature* of this evil of *Schism*, to the determination and *judgement* of *Ancient* and *Moderne Divines*, agreeing (as he does) in the *aggravations* of its sinfulnesse.

That some of the *Antients* (as *Hierom* confesses of himself) did perhaps *load their Adversaries*, with *charges* they were not guilty of, (or the *Controversie* would allow) must be yeelded as a *fault*. The ground whereof, was partly this, That they *saw further* into the ill *Consequances* of those opinions, than their *Adversaries* did foresee; and partly a corruption, which insinuates it self, into the best men, in the heat of their *Zeal* against errours, *viz.* to strive for victory, rather than *Truth*. And though *they* might so *miscarry* the notion of *Schism*, yet that all *Divines*, *Pious* & *Learned* in all ages, should so much mistake the *Nature* of it, is most im- §. 2.

improbable; as, that none, but himself, should *discover* that *mistake*, is not very reasonable to imagine.

§. 3. However the *Age* wherein we live, "hath in good measure, freed it "self from the bondage of Subjection "to the Dictates of men, because they "they lived before us: yet this course of *procedure*, hath not lost its *usefulnesse*, or is becom impertinent. The *concurring judgement* of all men, of all *perswasions*, in all Ages, carries weight of reason with it: especially when it agrees with, either *expresse Scripture*, or regular and *rationall deduction*, from it (to which he here professes to *stand* or *fall*) it is cheerfully to be received. That which may cause him *to lye low*, as to any expectation of *successe*, is not onely the *prejudice* of many ages the *interest* of most Christians, and *mutuall Consent* of parties at variance (taken commonly for unquestionable *evidence* of truth) but his own prejudicate *notion* of *Schism*, limiting it as he does, "to a difference or division in a parti-"cular *Assembly party*, which if it be not *clearly* and sufficiently made out, will blast his hopes of any good *issue*, by this *Discourse*, as himself professeth hereafter. pag. 30.

Bur

But he is not *Solicitous* of the event, endeavouring (as he sayes) to go, "whi-
"ther he should, not whither most
"men go.

§. 4. What *advatage* in this busi-
nesse, the first *chargers* of Schism upon
others, have gotten, is not very vi-
sible. "He that is first in his own cause, *Pro.* 18.
"is righteous, but his (innocent) neigh- 17.
"bour comes and tryes him. Those
that are most guilty of it, may first *cla-
mour* against the innocent, but at last
will be proved most *Schismaticall*. But
when men cannot reasonably *charge* o-
thers with that *crime*, as having never
*separated* from their *Churches*, (of which
they never were, as he speaks hereafter)
the *suspicion* at least, will lye at their own
door, who have *Separated* from all
Churches (of some whereof they once
were) and they must either prove them
all *Heretical* or *corrupt*, or themselves to
be *Schismaticall*, in separating from
them. The *Romanists* indeed have made
great use of this *Advantage*, to *accuse
first*, to hide their own greater *Schism*.
But the *Donatists* of old (and those that
succeed them now in their *principles*) had
no colour to charge *Schism* upon all
true Churches; for that must lye upon

them, that made so *causeless* a Separation; not upon the *Churches*, which never were of their *Association*. But the chief Advantage of *Rome*, lay in this; that having once bin a *Famous Church*, in the *Apostles* times, they plead the *priviledges* of that Church, to cover their *Apostacy*. "For (to use the words of our Au-"thor) if any partie of men can estate "themselves at large in all the priviledg-"es granted, and promises made to the "Church, in generall, they need not be "solicitous about dealing with them "that oppose them, having at once ren-"dered them no better than Jewes, and "Mahumetans, Heathens or Publicans, "by appropriating those privileges "unto themselves. Which practice, whe-ther it be not *imitated* by himself and partie; let him consider what ever is spoken in Scripture of the *Catholicke Church*, visible or invisible, they have too often applied to their own *particular Churches*: and count all without, that are not *within* the pale of their *Societies*, as is else where shewed. And I shall adde still his own words; "Whereas the par-"ties litigant, by all rules of law and "equity, ought to stand under an e-"quall regard, in all the severalls of

"their differences have been heard and "stated; one part, is hereby utterly "condemned before it is heard: and it "is all one unto them, whether they "are in the right or wrong. How *applicable* all this is to *themselves*, will appear ere we have done.

§. 5. In the mean time, (I still follow him) it cannot be denied, "but "that their vigorous adhering to the "former Advantage, (a thing to be ex-"pected from men, wise in their gene-"ration) hath exposed some of them to "a contrary evill; whilst, in a conceit "of their own innocencie, (as being "the only true Churches of Christ) they "have insensibly slipt (as is the man-"ner of men) into sleight, & contemp-"tible thoughts of Schism (wherof they "are accused) as esteeming it no great matter to separate from any, or all true Churches; making it no Schism no crime at all: as will appear hereafter. The *safest way* for them, is to deny this *Separation* to be a *Schism*: for otherwise, he asserts well; "To live in Schism is to "live in sinne; which unrepented of, "will ruine a mans eternall condition. Upon this therefore depends the *issue* of this whole cause; For if a *causeless Se-*

See p. 46

*paration* from a *true Church*, be proved a *Schism*, (as, I doubt not, it will) I shall adde his own words: "Every man "charged with it, must either desert his "station, which gives foundation to his "charge, or acquit himself of the crime, "in that station. And this *latter* (for he likes not to leave his *Station*) is that, which *in reference to himself and others, he does propose*, and mannages with much confidence; Upon this we put the whole issue of this present cause.

§. 6. For let not them think that the *Iniquitie* of their *Accusers* (as to other *corruptions*) doth in the least, extenuate their crime; "*Schism is Schism still*. Though our Churches, from whom they Separate, be not so pure as they ought or would be. Yea though we were worse than we are (as bad as the *Church* of *Corinth*) yet ought not they to separate from us, as no *Churches* of *Christ* (being desirous of *Reformation*) but are *Schismaticks* if they do. They ought rather to have stayed, and helped to *reforme* us; which they make almost *impossible* by their uncharitable *Separation* from us. This that followes, were worth their most serious consideration: "A "conscientious tenderness, and fear of

"being

"being mistaken, will drive this busi-"nesse, to another Issue, whereas their *Confidence* in carriage of their way, is a *stop* to their, and our *Reformation*.

§. 7. 8. 9. The *state* of things, in this time, is too well known in the world, to the great *scandall* of *Christianity*; "And wo is to them, by whom the offence cometh. 1. *Protestants* are charged by *Papists*, as *Schismaticks*, for departing (as they say) from the *Catholike Church*, which Church they are. 2. *Calvinists* by *Lutherans*, for no *crime* in the world but this (saves our Author) but because we *submit* not to all they teach: which he counts unreasonable, upon this ground: "That in no "instituted Church-relation, would "they ever admit us to stand with "them? Which is as considerable an in-"stance of the power of prejudice, as "this Age can give; unlesse it may be *paraleld* in his *own Church*: It is as well a *Schisme*, to keep *fit members*, out of *Church-Relations*, and priviledges, as to *separate* from a true Church. 3. *Presbyterians* are charged with the same *crime*, by *Episcopall* men, because they *reject* that way of *Government*, and somwhat of the externall *way of Worship*.

4. The

4. The *Independents* are accenſed, by *Preſbyterians*, of the ſame fault, for making *differences* in, and then *ſeparating* from their Churches, as no *true Churches*, and ſetting up *others* of their own. The learned Doctor ſuppoſes, this laſt charge, "is in a ſhort time, almoſt ſunke "of it ſelf; and ſo will ask the leſſe "paines, utterly to remove and take "off. But he is an *happy man*, if things out of *ſight*, were preſently out of minde. His party hath rather *ſunke* the charge by their *ſilence* in not anſwering, than *diſperſed* or removed it. And he will finde, that it *ſwims* on the face of thoſe *Diſcourſes*, written againſt their *way*; if he pleaſed to take notice of them. And this charge (revived by his *Importunity*) he will finde, will aske more paines to take off, than he is aware of: much *more* than we ſhall need to take, to remove the ſame *charge* from our ſelves, put upon us, by the other three ſorts of men; *Papiſts*, *Lutherans*, and *Epiſcopall*. Had it not been done often and ſufficiently, by men of our *own judgement*, himſelf hath removed it from us, in *removing* it from himſelfe, in this diſcourſe. But how he will *remove* ours, comes ſhortly to be conſidered.

§. 10 What

§. 10. What those *general principles*, of *irrefragable evidence* are, whereby he will *acquit* us all, and himself also from the *severall concernments*, in this *charge*, we shall readily attend unto. But how "the whole guilt of this crime, "shall be thrust into one Ephah, "and by whom carried to build it an "house, in the Land of Shinar, to esta-"blish it upon its own *Base* (as he *phra-sifies* it) I do not well understand. Onely I suppose, he will *discharge* the charge, by a new *definition* of *Schisme* (and some other like *distinctions*:) which if it be true, will carry it almost *quite* out of the world, & blesse the *Churches* with everlasting peace. All *Schisme*, shall be *confined* to a *particular church*: of which hereafter.

§. 11. But that he should professe his *much ratherneſſe*, to spend all his time, in *making up*, and *healing* the breaches and *Schisms* among Christians, than one *houre* in justifying our divisions, &c. seemeth strange to me, when as his whole book, or greatest part, is (as a *learned Doctour* said) one great *Schisme*, and in the *Designe* of it, nothing but a *justification* of himself, and partie, in their *Divisions*, with us, and *Separation* P. 8.

from

from us; and tells us, the cause is so *irreconcilable*, that none but the *Lamb*, is worthy or able to *close* the differences made: Who when he will come, *and put forth the greatnesse of his power*, is very uncertain; and he puts us out of hope, that before that, it shall be accomplished. And yet sayes; "In the "mean time, a Reconciliation amongst "all Protestants, is our dutie, and practi- "cable; and had perhaps, ere this, been "in some forwardnesse, had men rightly "understood, wherein such a reconcili- "ation, according to the mind of God "doth consist. Which, I hope, he will, ere we part, give us to understand. He seems to place it much, in a *principle of forbearance*; that is, in *Toleration* of one another, in any way of *Religion*; the *cursed fruits* whereof we reap (with *lamentation*) at this day. They have indeed strongly improved that *principle* of *forbearance*, to perswade us to *beare* with them; but how little of it, they have shewed to us, the world is Judge.

§. 12. The two *generall wayes* fixed on by some, for compassing of *peace*, and *union* among Christians, deserve some consideration, and to be searched to the bottom.

bottom: The one is, *inforcing uniformity* by a *secular* power: the other, is *Toleration*, of all, or most *waies* of Religion; (except such as concerne the *Civill interest*). He speaks first of them both together; as if, there were no hope of union, peace, love to be expected from either, "though "men of a good zeal, and small experi-"ence, or any other account, may pro-"mise themselves much thereof. It is "something else, that must give peace, "than what is the product of the pru-"dentiall considerations of men. As for *Toleration*, it is indeed a *prudentiall* way of those *Erastian Politicians*, he speaks of below, "that would have the world "in quietness on any terms *Sect.* 15. "let what will be come of Religion, *Sect.* "17. yet indeed is *folly* and no *pru-dentiall* way: When men have tryed all *wayes*, to settle their *interests*; *pietie*, in cleaving to the *way* of God, is the best *policie*; as the events of both, (to which he oft appeals) have manifested: And, on the other side, The Common-wealth of *Israel*, never prospered better, than when it *enforced uniformitie*, in the way of *Religion* prescribed. But this *uniformitie* compelled, is a *product* of *Divine pru-dence*, in the first and second Command-

dements.

clements. And if *Christ* hath instituted any *way* of *Religion* and *worship*, in the New Testament, that alone must be *enforced* on all the members of the Church.

§. 13. Yet concerning that *Uniformity* enforced, he sayes, "It is the readiest "meanes in the world, to root out all "Religion from the hearts of men; which if it were true, were a *present Argument* for *Toleration*; which yet hee seemes not to like. But 1. This was, by *God*, thought the best way to *plant* and preserve *Religion*, in the hearts of the Jewes. Those great *Reformers* so famous among them, *Josiah*, &c. are commended for *compelling* of people, and *binding* them by oath, to serve the Lord. 2. The *parable* of *compelling* men to come in to the *wedding*, seems (in the Judgement of no mean *Divines*) to allow a power, to bring men to the *publick Ordinances* of *worship*. 3. *Toleration* (which is our *present condition*, *Sect.* 12.) hath done much more towards the *rooting of Religion*, out of the hearts of many men, in 7. yeares, than the enforcing of *uniformity* did in 70 yeares. 4. To *compell uniformitie*, (in a true, or false way) may, by the *corruptions* of mens hearts,

hearts, breed *Hypocrisie*, *Formality*, *Atheism*, and *Anxietie* of conscience in some: But good and gracious *souls*, have been discovered, and *purified* by it, as the three *Children*, and *Martyrs* have manifested? 5. Many, at least some, that were enforced to *conformitie* in the worship of God, in *families*, or congregations, have *blessed* God for that *compulsion*; who before were *Atheists* or *profane* while they had a *cursed, intolerable toleration*, to be of any or no *Religion*. Lastly, the will indeed cannot be forced to believe; but that *professed Christians* should be *compelled* to the *externall profession* of that *only way* of worship, which Christ hath instituted seems as *equall* & reasonable, as it is *unreasonable*, that men be left to their own choice, to *worship* God, either not at all, or after their own fancies. And he that denyes this, seems to mee, to bee, if not *an Atheist*, a *Skeptick* in Religion.

*Fieri nec potest, nec solet, ut Deum sincerè colat qui diversas simul Religiones fovere desiderat: certissimum est, neutram credere qui contrarias admittit*, Gregor Tholos.

§. 14. I expected now, that he, (having said so much against *enforcing* of *uniformitie*) should have said as much, or something, against *Toleration*; which he calls also a *prudentiall way*, for Reconciliation. Does he thinke *this* (if not the other) is the readie way to *plant* Religion in mens

mens hearts? Let experience speake; If since the men of *his way* have gotten a *Toleration* for themselves, they have not opened a *doore* for all *errours, heresies*, and horrid *blasphemies*, or prophanesse. But if both these principles bee by him decryed (as hee seemes to insinuate; "because "he finds, that events & executions fol- "low not the consciencions embracing "of one or other of these decryed *Prin-* "*ciples*, he should have done good ser- vice, if he had shewed us another way, to this *due* and *practicable Reconciliation* which he hath not done; but only tells us, "he is perswaded that a gene- "rall alteration of the state of the "Churches of Christ in this world, must "determine this controversie. The discovery of that way, might perhaps have freed us, from "the vanitie of "those reasonings, wherewith we are in- "tangled. But I am to seeke what hee meanes, when he sayes, "he hath some- "while since ceased to be moved by the "clamours of men, concerning bloody "persecution on the one hand, and curs- "ed intolerable toleration on the o- "ther. As if he tooke them to be idle *clamours* of men that cry down *enfor-* *cing uniformitie*, as bloody persecution

on

on the one hand or *toleration* on the other hand, as *cursed* and *intolerable*. What, or which of them will please him? or are both of them *usefull*, according to the various *interests* of Nations? And I would know, why he calls, *enforcing uniformitie*, by the name of *bloody persecution*. Surely to force *conformitie* to the *way* of God, is no *Persecution*; much lesse *bloody*: but is only a *just prosecution* of evill and refractory *Rebells* to the Kingdome of Christ; unlesse *Magistrates* may be called *bloody persecutors*, in *prosecuting* malefactors unto death. And againe, if *prosecution* of such offenders, as conforme not to the way of God, bee just and necessary, then *Toleration* of such, in other wayes, is and ought to be accounted *intolerable*, and will be *cursed*. Certaine it is, that the *embracing* of, either *bloody persecution* (which is against the *truth*) or *toleration* of all *Religions* (as well as the truth) have had *providentiall events*, suitable thereunto, as men have placed their *civill interests* in them; both have met with *untimely* ends, and fearfull destruction. §. 15.

He that shall indeed consider, the *proposalls* and attempts made for *Ecclesi-*

*aſticall peace*, in this *little world* of ours, of later times (not to look back to former) either by *Eraſtian politicians*, on the one ſide, or *Jeſuiticall Toleration-iſts*, on the other, "will quickly aſ-"ſume, the libertie of affirming, con-"cerning them all, that as wiſe men "might eaſily ſee flawes in all of them, "and an unſuitableneſſe to the end pro-"poſed; and as good men might ſee ſo "much of carnall intereſt, ſelfe, and hy-"pocriſie in them, as might diſcou-"rage them from any great expectation: "ſo upon many other accounts, a better "iſſue was not to be looked for from "them, than hath beene actually ob-"tained, which hath for the moſt part "been this, that thoſe that could diſ-"ſemble moſt deeply, have beene "thought to have (and have had) "the greateſt advantage; and thoſe "that have come with the leaſt candor, "moſt fraud, hypocriſie, ſecular baits for "the ſubverting of others, have in ap-"pearance, for a ſeaſon, ſeemed to ob-"taine ſucceſſe; And in this ſpirit of "craft and contention, are things yet "carryed on in the world. This *wit-neſſe is true*, therefore *rebuke* them ſharp-ly.

It is true also, that the *parties* at variance now, (*Independents*, and *Presbyterians*) "are so well acquainted at length, "with each others principles, Argu- "ments, Interests, Prejudices, and reall "distance of their causes, that none of "them expect any Reconciliation, but "meerly by one parties keeping its sta- "tion, and the other coming over whol- "ly unto them. The one partie are got *so high*, that they will not come down to the other; the other are so *strongly convinced* of the errour of their *Independent way*, that they may not, cannot come up to them: In what a *sad condition* is poor *England* the while; like to be *torne in pieces*, by her own Children. §. 16.

I shall adde something of the next Section, "whereupon having a mutu- "all diffidence in each other, they grow "weary of all endeavours to be carryed "on joyntly in this kind: And this is "like to be the state of things, untill a- "nother Spirit be powred out on the "professours of Christianitie, than that "wherewith at present, they seeme "mostly to be acted. Now the *God of grace, and peace*, powre out that other *good Spirit* upon this *Church* and Nation, before they be utterly destroyed. §. 17.

§. 18. But is there no *Balme* in *Gilead*? no hopefull way of Reconciliation? Yes, he tells us. "The only way re-"maining to be fixed on, whilst our di-"visions continue, is to enquire where-"in the guilt of them doth consist, and "who is justly charged therewith: in "speciall, what is, and who is guiltie of "the sinne of *Schisme*. And this will we also do if God permit.

§. 19. Much hath been written, upon this *subject* of *Schisme*, by very learned men; who rather (as he sayes) en-deavoured, "to convince their Adver-"saries (the Romanists) of the insuffici-"encie of their charge of the Church of "England to be Schismaticks, in sepa-"rating from them; than rightly and "cleerly to state the thing or matter "contended about: which latter seems to me very *strange*; For how could they *remove* the *charge* of *Schisme*, and not sufficiently declare what *Schisme* is? wherein they and their *Adversaries* a-greed: But our *Reverend Doctor*, had a double *designe* in this undertaking: 1. To shew us a *new way* of his own, to dispell that *charge*, by giving us a new *Definition* of *Schisme*, not known, or made use of in former times. 2. Thereby to remove the *charge* of *Schisme*,

Schism, from himself and his *partie*; for so he sayes here, and hereafter; "The "present concernment of some fearing "God, lying beyond, what other men "have undertaken, somthing may be "farther added, as to the satisfaction of "the consciences of men unjustly accu-"sed of this crime; which is my aime. What *satisfaction* he can give us and the world in this *undertaking*, we shall, by his good leave, take notice of. Only premising this; that I intend not to deale with whole *Chapter* and *Section*, as hitherto I have done; consenting with him in his *Removall* of that part of the charge of *Schism*, which is common to him with us; and onely observe, how he will free himselfe, from that part of it, which *concerns* himself and his partie.

# CHAP.

## CHAP. II.

### *Of the Nature of Schisme in Scripture.*

§. 1. THis *reverend and learned Authour* (as appeares from his, pag. 16, Sect. 16, of the first Chapter) undertakes to answer a *Popish* charge of *Schisme*, upon the *Church* of England, directed to both the *Universities*. And in his *vindication* of our Church, (as was expected) carries on the debate so farre, as not only to *vindicate* himselfe and his partie from the like charge, by some at *home*, but also (as many wise men think) to *unchurch* his *mother* the *Church of England*; and to find or leave no *Churches* here, but his own as the *Donatists* of old did. That this is the *result* of his discourse (if not the *designe*) will appeare, before we have done. But we shall attend at present, to the method of his proceeding; who thus begins. "The thing whereof we
"treat being a disorder, in the instituted
P. 21. "worship of God, I suppose it a modest
"request to desire, that we may abide
"solely to that discoverie and descripti-
"on, which is made of it in Scripture;
"that

"that that alone shall be esteemed "Schism, which is there so called, or "hath the entire nature of that, which is "there so called. It is (they say) an ill *signe* or *omen*, to *stumble* at the threshold, in going out. The first part of these words, is very *ambignous*, and may have a double sense, either that Schism is to be found in *matter* of instituted worship only, or only in the *differences* made, in the *time* of celebrating *instituted worship*: and neither of these is true, or yet proved, and so a meer *begging* of the *question*: Yet both of these; are asserted by him hereafter; the first, Sect 23. the latter, Sect. 9. of which, more when we come at them. In the meane time we assert the contrary. "That as there "may be Schism in the Church about "other matters, besides instituted wor-"ship; so there may also be Schism, "in other places and times, than those "of celebrating worship. For the se-cond part of the words, which is a *Re-quest*, it shall by me be readily granted. "That we abide solely to that discovery, "and description, which is made of it in "Scripture; that, that alone be esteemed "Schism, which is there so called, or "which hath the entire nature of that,

"which is there so called. That is, that only shall be esteemed *Schism*, which is either *expressly* in Scripture so called, or in æquivalent words, or may be deduced thence, by *regular*, and *rational consequence*, as he said above, chap. 1. §. 3.

§. 2. p. 23.

What the Scripture-*use* and *notion* of the word is, is then first to be enquired: It is taken there, either in the prime and *proper* sense, with respect to *bodyes naturall*, for a *seperation* into parts, or (as he expresses it, p. 24.) "an interruption "of continuitie, by an external power, "a division of parts before-*continued*: the places are cited by himselfe, *Matth.* 9. 16. *Matth* 27. 51. "the vaile of the Tem-"ple was rent, from the top to the bot-tome into 2 *parts*; Or in the *metaphori-call* sense, from *bodyes naturall*, to bodyes *civill*, or *ecclesiasticall*; In a civill body, *Joh.* 7. 43. "There was a Schisme or "division among the *people*. So *Act.* 14. "4. the multitude of the cittie was di-"vided; that was not only in their *opini-ons* and *judgments*, but also into *parts* or parties, for so it's added, ἦν δὲ πλῆθος, "and some were with the Jewes, and "some with the *Apostles*. So *Act* 23. 7. the multitude was divided, some *follo-wing*

wing one, some another of their *leaders*, in that dissension; which is the *reverend Doctors* own glosse. Thus also it is expressed, in his *Testimonie* in the margine "The Inhabitants of *Rome*, were parted "into two parts, and no more agreed, "among themselves, and there was a "great *Schism*. They were divided, not only in their *judgments*, but in their societies also, into *two parties*. This then being the *notion* and nature of it in the *naturall* and *politicall* sense, it might easily *slip*, into the like, in its *Ecclesiasticall* use; to signifie, not only a *difference in Judgment*, but a *separation* into *parties* also. As the *Assembly* may be *Civill* or *Ecclesiasticall*; so there may be a twofold *Schism* in each, (differing only *gradually*) either a *division* in *opinion* onely, or into *Parties* also, one part separating from another. And that the rather, because the latter is the *ordinary issue* or consequence of the former. See *Act.* 19. 9. There was but one assembly at the first, in the *Synagogue*. "But "when divers spake evill of that way ἀφώρισε "before the multitude, *Paul* departed, "and separated the *Disciples*, &c.

p. 24.

§. 3. p. 25.

It is true, that in the *Ecclesiasticall* sense, the word is not to be *found* used, but

but in 1 Cor. 1. 10. & 11. 18. &c: only in the case of *differences* amongst the *Corinthians*; "I heare, that there are "σχίσματα among you; which what they were, will presently come to be considered, when we have heard, what he accounts in generall, the *constant use* of the word; "To denote differences of "mind and judgment, with troubles p. 25. "ensuing thereon, amongst men met in some one Assembly, about the "the compassing of a common end and "designe. But that this is a *forestalling* of the *Readers judgment*, by a meer *begging* of *the question*, hath in part been proved, even from the *Scripture* it selfe, where it is used for *separation* into parties, upon those *differences* of mind and judgment, in the *politicall* use of the word; and why it may not be so used, in the *Ecclesiasticall* sense, I see yet no reason; especially when the *proper* use of it, is, to signifie a *breach* of *union*, or a *separation* of a naturall body, into severall parts, two or more. And I have cause to *suspect*, that he *sticks* so hard upon this *notion*, not so much to *confute* that charge of *Schisme* upon us, by the *Romanists*, as to *ward* off the same *charge* upon *himselfe* and his *parties*; as we shall shew hereafter: But, granting him this

notion

notion of *Schisme*, for a while; this is the way, as on the one hand, to free all *Church separation*, from *Schisme*, with respect to one another; so on the other to make all *particular Churches*, more or lesse *Schismaticall*. For what one *Congregation* almost is there in the world, where there are not *differences* of judgments, whence ensue many *troubles*, about the *compassing* of one common end and designe. I doubt whether his own be free therefrom. Yet he askes confidently below, p. 63. "Have we any "differences and contentions in our Assemblies? Doe we not worship God, "without disputes and divisions? Its *happie* with them, if it be so: For let most of the *Assemblyes* of severall *sorts* and *sects* be visited, and it will be *visible* enough, that in their *prophecyings*, (as they call them) there are *differences* of mind enow, and *troubles* more than a good many, with *wranglings* and *janglings*, and sometimes *railing* and *revilings* good store, that a man might (upon this one *principle* of his, besides other) venture to call them *Schismaticall Conventicles*, rather then *Churches* of Christ. And why not, as well as *Paul* charges that *famous Church* of *Corinth*, with the crime of *Schisme*, for the same or like dis-

p. 27. disorders? "They had (layes our Au-"thour) differences amongst themselves, "about unnecessary things: on these "they engaged into disputes and sidings "even in their solemne Assemblyes, "probably much vain jingling, aliena-"tion of affections, exasperation of spi-"rits, with a neglect of due offices of "love, &c. This was their *Schism*, "&c. That the *Apostle* charges this upon them, is *true*; but was this all? were there not *divisions* into parties, as well as in *judgement*? we shall consider that ere long. For the present, I say, *difference* in judgment, was the ready way, to *difference* in, and *alienation* of affections, and that to exasperation of Spirits, and that to neglect of due offices of love, &c: and at last ere long, to *Separation* of *Societies*. And he layes well. "The Apostle would have them "joyned together, not only in the "same Church-order, and fellowship, "but also in one-nesse of mind and "judgment, which if they were not, "Schisms would be amongst *them*, and upon those, *separation*, into severall *as-semblyes*; as we see at this day, to a *lamentation*. *Difference* in some one point, of *doctrine*, *worship*, or *discipline*, hath broken

*Separation may proceed from Schism.* p. 194.

p. 28.

broken the Church into many *fractions*, almost as many as men; But I shall observe his *observations* upon these *Divisions* amongst the *Corinthians*.

1. Observe (saies hee) "That the §. 4.
"thing mentioned, is entirely in one p. 29.
"Church: no mention of one Church
"divided against another, or separated
"from another, or others: the crime
"lyes wholy within one Church, that
"met together, for the worship of
"God, &c: This it seemes, is a matter
of *great concernment*, to be granted or
denyed. In so much that he professes, p. 30.
"That unlesse men will condescend so
"to state it, upon the evidence tender-
"ed, he shall not hope to prevaile much,
"in the processe of his discourse. This
then being the foundation of that great
*Fabrick* of *Schism*, as he calls it, it had
need bee *better* layd, than upon his
own bare *Affirmation*, which is all we
yet have for it, without any proofe. For
this end, I shall take his first *observation*, into particular consideration. 1.
That the *divisions* mentioned, were in
*one Church* is *ambiguously* spoken: for it
may be taken either for the *collection* of
severall *Assemblies* in *Corinth* (where
there were multitudes of Christians)
which

which are sometimes called the *Church*, yea a *particular Church*, with respect to the *Catholick* or other *National* Churches So himselfe speaks of those "Patriarchs
p. 121. "(so called) how many or how few soe-
"ver they were, they were particular
"Churches. Or else, that the *Saints* at *Corinth*, were, at this time, but one *particular congregation*, meeting all, in one place. In this latter sense, its evident, the *Reverend Doctor* takes it; but in so doing he *begges* the question, and consents not with himselfe. For, he had said before, "they had disputings
"and sidings, in their solemne Assem-
p. 27. "blyes, not one, but many *Assemblyes*. And the *Divines* of the *Assembly*, have made it more than probable, that the multitude of *Christians* of *Corinth*, were too many to meet in one place, and yet may be said to *meet together* ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, not *jointly*, but severally in their particular places of meeting. As the Congregations of *London*, may be said to meet together on the *Lords Day*, not *conjunctim*, but *divisim*; 2. That, it was amongst the *members* of one particular Church, is *gratis dictum*; For that all the *Christians* in *Corinth*, and about it, were called one *Church* collectively, is evident

vident, *chap.* 1. *v.* 2. "To the Church "of God, at *Corinth*. And that there were more *particular Churches* there, or thereabouts than one, is also evident, both by *Rom.* 16. 7. *The Church at Cenchrea*, a particular Church distinct from that at *Corinth*, and also by, 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. "Let "your women keep silence in the "Churches; one and yet many *Churches* at *Corinth*. 3. This is also presumed, but not proved, "That the crime of "Schism was charged on them, onely, "within the verge of one Church; as if all their *Divisions* were *confined* to the Church; whereas there were *Schisms* and *differences*, abroad and out of the Church; which I shall evince, first from the *Scripture* it selfe. The differences or *Schisms* were of severall kinds; Some *out* of the *Assembly*, *chap.* 1. & chap. 3. *sidings about their Teachers*, as he speaks p. 27. one said, *I am* of *Paul*, &c: these were, its likely, abroad as they met, one with another; Some were in the *Assembly*, as those he charges them with *chap* 11. 18. "When you come toge- "ther in the Church, I heare that there "are divisions among you. But the Doctor carryes it so, as if all their *differences* were in the Church meeting, when

when they [illegible] God; for reasons hereafter to be given. The *Apostle* seemes to charge them thus: "I hear "there are Schisms among you, not "only, in private Conferences, *chap.* 1. "but also, which is worse, in your "solemne *Assemblyes*, *chap.* 11. when "you meet to worship God." And this is the Doctors own Gloss, *Cunabares confessa*; p. 27. "not content to make this "difference, the matter of their debates "and disputes, from house to house, "(but) even when they met for publick "worship, or that which they all met "in, and for, they were divided on that "account, (alas) *chap.* 11. This was their *Schisme*, but not the only, though the *worser*, Schisme, which he confounds too much, to lead us away in a mist.

4. That there was no one *Church* divided against another, or separated from another, is assumed, but not proved, unlesse by a *Negative*, which is invalid; "There is no mention of such a separati-"on, therefore there was none: of "which in the next.

§. 5. 2. "Here is no mention of any par-"ticular man, or number of men's sepa-p. 30. "ration from the Assemblyes of the "whole Church, or of subduction of

"them-

"themselves, from its power, &c: only "they had groundlesse, causelesse diffe- "rences amongst themselves.

But was this all? were there not *separations* made, if not from that *Church* yet in that *Church*, as well as *divisions*? Let the Scripture determine this. 1. The *Apostle*, *cap.* 1. charges them with *sidings about their Teachers*, *v.* 11. "It "hath beene declared to mee, that there "are Schisms among you: One saith "*I am of Paul*, and I of *Apollo*, &c: And againe, *chap.* 3. *v.* 3. "Whereas there is "among you, envying, and strife, and "divisions are ye not carnall, and walke "as men? For while one saith, I am of "*Paul*, and another, I am of *Apollo*, are "ye not carnall? That is, I am a *disciple* of *Paul*, said one, and I of *Apollo* said another: In our *language*, I am a *member* of such a *Ministers* Congregation, sayes one; such a *man* for my mony: and I am of such a *mans* Congregation, said another; and so a third: And hereupon, they (most probably) *separated* themselves, into such and *such Congregations*; with *slighting* and contempt of other *Ministers*, with *respect* to their own. And is not *Separation* the ordinary issue of such *envying*, *strife*, and con-

σχισματα.

tentions? Let experience, this day, speake. As *Love* is the Mother of Union; so *Envy* and strife, of *Separation*.

2. That there was a separation of parties in the Church of *Corinth*, at least as to one Ordinance, appeares, cap. 11. that of the Lords Supper (as some do now) *v.* 18. with 21. 22. 33. They would, such a company (the richer sort perhaps) meet and receive the Supper together; and separating themselves, not tarry to take the poore with them. This was part of their Schisme which the Apostle charges them with, and warnes them of; They were not yet gone so farre in Schisme, as to separate from the Church, by gathering of Churches, in opposition to it; but they were next door to it; they made separations in the Church, first in their differences of judgment, and then into parties, as to some Ordinances. Not long after, they separated into other Churches, slighting and undervaluing the first Ministers or Churches, as nothing, or lesse pure than their own; which wee see practised sufficiently at this day. 3. But suppose it granted, there was but one single congregation at *Corinth*, yet the Apostle debarring the

*See*, Jeams 2. 1, 2. &c.

Bre-

Brethren, *v.* 10. from Schisme, and writing to more than the Church of *Corinth*, *v.* 2. even "all that call upon the "name of the Lord Jesus, in every "place.

3. "Here is no mention of any sub- §. 6.
"straction of obedience from Bishops, Rulers, the Pope, *&c.*: Nor does the A- p. 31.
"postle charge them as Schismaticks "from the nationall Church of *Achaia*, &c: For the first part, it is no wonder; for such kind of *Creatures* were not yet hatched, till many of some generations after. And for the other, the *Church*, was yet but small in *Achaia*, (some *scattered Saints* there might be, but few Churches) and therefore they are charged only for their *Divisions*, and separations in, or from the Church of *Corinth*, according to the severall *Ministers*, which they set up; as is most probable. As in the like case, by him instanced in p. 32. the time of *Clemens*: "Some few unquiet "persons at *Corinth*, drew the whole So- "ciety into division, and an opposition "to their *Elders*, a few men acted by pride "and madness; yet such power had those "persons in the Congregation, that they "prevailed to depose the Elders, and "cast them out of Office. Is it not rea-

*See him* p. 37. f

*sonable* to thinke, they set up *new Elders* and new Congregations? and more *unreasonable* to thinke, that the whole *Church*, ranne into this *madnesse*? and so some *Congregations* remaining sound, the rest made *Separations* from them: and this, *Clement* calls their *Schisme*. And besides his severall words, to declare it, ἔρις, ἔρις, &c; his word μεταστῆσαι, which signifies, *to lead away a people*, καλῶς πολιτευομένους, &c, "those that walk "well, from their honoured Service (though the *Doctor* waves to know what it meant,) and *misconstrues* it; I say, the word μεθιστάντες implyes a *separation* into other *Assemblies*: as the manner of seducers is, "speaking per-"verse things, to draw away, (ἀποστρέφειν) "Disciples after them, Act. 20. 30. The like may be conceived, though not so *clearly* expressed, in this first *Schisme* at *Corinth*, the same Church, and place: Surely those *differences* noted by *Clement* in the same Church, were not *divisions* in the *Church*, met together to worship God; but out of the Church, and cauling *separations* from the Elders, and so from the Church, breaking of it into *fractions*; which yet he calls their *Schisme*.

As for his notion of παροικία, in *Cle-*

*ment*, to signifie then, not a province (as some,) but a citie Church, consisting of many Congregations, the Church παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην, Κόρινθον, &c I am apt to *believe* his conjecture to be true. The Church *inhabiting Rome*, or the Church at *Rome* (which at that time, had no such large *Territories*, as a Church *provinciall*, or *Metropolitane*, as some rather *dream*, than prove) as its said of the *Church* in or at *Jerusalem*, *Act.* 8. 1. and the Church of God, τὴ οὖσα ἐν Κορίνθῳ, at *Corinth*. But yet I cannot agree with him, that either *Rome* or *Corinth*, were in *Clements* time, onely one *Parish*, (as he now uses the word for one *Congregation*, meeting all in one place. For as I believe this *Epistle* of *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, was intended to be written to the *Church* of *Cenchrea* (which whether it were a *seated distinct Church* or no the *Doctor* knowes not *p.* 39. nor was perswaded it was compleated *p.* 38. but yet supposes, it *comes under the* same name with *Corinth*, ibid. though *Paul* mentions it, as a *distinct* Church, *Rom.* 16. 1. and *Phebe* to be a *Deaconesse*, or Servant of that *Church*) to the *Church*, I say, at *Cenchrea*; So I see no reason, but there might be & were several *Churches*, *p.* 34.

or Assemblies in *Corinth*, each distinct from other; though not such *Parishes*, as ours are, in *London*, &c: the greater part, being yet *Heathens*, and the *Magistrates* not yet *Christian*, to erect, or allow them *Churches*, as now we call them; or to *distribute* them into particular *Parishes*; which was done, as soon, as most or all became *Christians*. However, the Doctor acknowledges

p. 35. "the word *Parochia* may be so called, "from them who met together to break "bread, and to eate, from παροχὴ & con- "*vivator*. Whence it will follow, that if the *multitude* be so great, that they cannot *meet* in one place, to *heare the word*, or to *break bread* (as its evident the 3000, or 5000 at *Jerusalem*, could not) then look how many *meeting places* there were for this purpose, so many *Parishes*, or Congregations there were, at *Jerusalem* or *Corinth*, having severall, if not *fixed Elders* over them, and yet the *whole* but one *Church*.

§. 7. p. 42. But if he grant, that this *evill* mentioned by the *Apostle*, is *Schisme*, does it conclude that nothing else is *Schisme*? He answers, "he is inclinable so to do, "and resolved, that unlesse any man

can

"can prove, that ſomthing elſe is termed "Schism by ſome Divine writer, &c: he "will be at Liberty from admitting it ſo "to be. Surely this is no ſafe Rule to go by: For as there are ſome *vertues*, which are not termed ſo, expreſly in Scripture: So there may be degrees of *Schiſm*, which are not ſo expreſly called there. It is ſufficient; if the one have the *nature* of ſuch a virtue, the other of ſuch a *crime*, though not ſo called. There are other words uſed to ſignifie the ſame thing. As *Rom.* 16. 17. διχοστασία, of στάσις and διχο, as ſignifying *a diviſion into two parts*, or parties; And what thinks he of the word αἵρεσις, which comes from a root, that ſignifies ſometimes *trahere* to *draw*, and ſometimes *ſectari* to *follow*; as *Sect-maſters* uſe to *draw away Diſciples after them*: and thoſe that follow them are called *Secta, à ſequendo*. The *opinions* of the *Philoſophers*, of ſeverall Sects, were called αἱρέσεις, *hereſies*; and their followers, *ſects*, divided not onely in *opinion*, but in parties and Schools alſo. So *Paul* uſes the word, *Act.* 26. 5. "according to the moſt "ſtrict Sect, of our Religion, I lived a "phariſee: And is not *hereſie* as bad a word as *Schiſm*? or is it any advantage

*See Conſtil. 1. Conſtantinop. ſome are called Hereticks; that hold the ſound faith* ἀναχίζοντας δὲ, καὶ ἀλλοτρίους ἀγνοίας τοῖς κανονικοῖς ἀπειθοῦντας.

for a *separatist*, to change his name, from *Schismatick* to *Heretick*? The Apostle 1 *Cor.* 11. 18, 19. uses them promiscuously, one for another: "I hear that there are "*Schisms among you. For there must be here-* "*sies among you also.* The word *heresie* commonly is used to signifie *errour against Faith*, (which sense he is not pleased with, p. 46.) as *Schism* is a sin against *love*; If he like not to give his *Separation*, the name of *Schism* (though it hath fully the *nature* of it) let him have good leave to call it Heresie; This men *gaine* when they will *dispute* about words.

Besides, the Scripture uses other words to signifie Schism, in a political sense; *Math.* 12. 25. A Kingdome or house, μεριδθεῖσα, divided against it selfe; that is, into parts, and so into civill warres and dissensions, cannot stand: which *Act.* 14. 4. is expressed by ἐσχίσθη, the multitude was divided, and that into two parts (as well as opinions) as it followes; and some *now* were with the Jewes, and some with the Apostles; as I noted above: If this may not rather be understood of an Ecclesiasticall separation, for it was occasioned by differences in one

Assembly,

Assembly, *v.* 1. They entred into the Synagogue of the *Jews*, *&c.*: The unbelieving *Jews* stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds ill affected against the brethren, *v.* 2. which called that Separation.

And the Schism was made by those turbulent Jewes, the causes of that separation, not by the Apostles or their partie.

*Schism*, in the *Church*, was but an *Embrio*, in the *Apostles* time; at first a *difference* or division onely in *judgment* but quickly grew into *separation* or division into *parties*.

But we need not *plead* any other text for our *notion* of *Schism*, but what is included in this place of the *Corinthians*, having made it appeare, that there was a *separation* made in that Church, by such as *lead away Disciples* after them, or rather by them; who by having the *faith* of *our Lord Jesus Christ* in *respect of persons*, set up one *Minister* above another, and against another. However, something may be *deduced* by paritie of reason "If "divisions of persons, in a church, in "judgment, may be & is called Schism, in "Scripture, then Separation from a true

"Church

"Church, (grounded upon those divi-
"sions at first in an Assembly, about un-
"necessary things, as he said) may well
"and much more be called Schism.
For (says he) he is a Schismatick,
p. 43. "guiltie of this name of Schism, who
"raiseth or incourageth or persisteth
"in such differences. And is not he
much more a Schismatick, who having
raised groundlesse differences in a Church,
and persisting in them, draws Disciples
after him, and sets up another Church in
opposition to that from whence he se-
parated? To separate men in judgment
in a Church, is Schism, and time had
enough but to separate them from the
Church, upon the former, if it were worse.
Now this, as it may be done in a Church
of many Congregations, all professing
the same truths, and practising the same
worship: So also by setting in such diffe-
rences by any one Congregation against
the rest, is a Schism in that Church (as
of Corinth) and ends commonly in sepa-
ration from that Church. But let us
heare further, what is required to make
guiltie of Schism.

§. 8. 1. "That they be members of, or be-
"long to some one Church, which is so
"by

"by the institution and appointment of "Jesus Christ. The ground of this asser-tion is, that he by *one Church*, meanes only one *particular Church*, or Congre-gation; so that if a man be not a *mem-ber* of that one Church, he can neither be a *Schismatick* to that Church, nor to any other. But this, I suppose, to be his μεγα σφαλμα, his *great mistake*, and the cause of all his *miscarriage* hereafter. For as there may be a *Schism* in a *Citie-Church*, of many Congregations, which are such, by the appointment, or *allow-ance* of Jesus Christ, (I suppose them all *Independent*, if he please): So one that is a *member* of one of the Congregations of that *Church*, yea that is a *member* of none of those, but of some other, may be a *Schismatick* to that Church *col-lectively* taken, and to any one of those *particular* Congregations, to wit, if he shall *raise any differences* in any one of them, and *persist* to maintain them, be-ing either *expresly* against the *Gospel*, or meerly of things *unnecessary*, &c. And this I shall prove; 1. By the Doctors *own principle*; "*He that raiseth diffe-*"*rences in any Congregation (and persists* "*therein) is a Schismatick*; as was newly by him asserted. But that *Christian* that

breaks

breaks the *peace* of any Church, more *generall* or *particular*, by *erroneous* or unnecessary disputes; *raises differences* in that Church; and therefore he is a *Schismatick*. Then it follows, that it is not *necessarily* required, to the *guilt* of *Schism*, that he be a *member* of that *one Church*, but he may be a member of *another* Church, or of *no Church*, but only a *Christian*. 2. I prove it from a Scripture instance, *Act.* 15. 1. "*Certaine* "*men which came down from* Judæa, (to "Antioch) *taught the brethren saying*, "*except ye be circumcised*, &c. *ye cannot* "*be saved*. These men were no *members* of the Church of *Antioch*, but of *Judæa*, or *Christians* at large, of no *particular* Church: yet these men, *making differences* in the Church of *Antioch*, are said, v. 24. "*to trouble them with words*, "*subverting their* Souls, and therefore might justly be called *Schismaticks*. He cannot now say, this was not a *Church* of the *institution* of Christ; for whether it was then but one *particular* Congregation, or consisted of *many* congregations, (as not able to *meet* in one place), both wayes it was a *Church* of *Christs appointment*. For the very *light* of reason, speaks thus much, That when

a

a Congregation of first Church grows too numerous, it should swarm out into lesser Congregations: and yet those distinct Congregations may fairly be said to be but one Church, and have still some dependence (what ever tribe) one upon another.

2. "It is required (saies he) that they §. 9.
"either raise, entertain or pursue p. 44.
"cause of these differences with them of
"that Church, &c: This is answered in the former in part. And I adde, that those differences raised, &c. in that Church though by a member of another Church, do cause "an Interruption of "that exercise of love, which ought to be "amongst them, and the disturbance of the "duties required of that Church, in the "worship of God, which he requires to make one guiltie of Schism. It were very strange, that he that entertaines, or persists in those differences should be a Schismatick, and he that first raised them (though of another Church) should be none.

3. "It is further required, that these §. 10.
"differences be occasioned by, and do
"belong to some things, in a remoter or
"neerer distance to the worship of
"God. This will reach a great way;

even

even *civill differences* (as they may be called *Schisms* as we heard above) they may come to stand upon the *worship* of God. But may there not be *differences* in other matters, besides *worship*, which may amount to *Schisme*? He told us above, that Schisme might be, in *necessary things*, yea things that *properly* concerne not the *worship* of God; such were those *fiding about their Teachers*, not in the *worship* of God, but from *house* to *house*, as he confessed above. But supposing the *differences* to be in the *worship* of God, that is, in the *rites and places* of it, may they not be in matter of *doctrine*; perhaps he will say, that is *Heresie*, or *Apostasie*, not *Schisme* (for so he sayes, p. 102.) But, *Every difference in matter of doctrine*, is not *Heresie*, much lesse *Apostasie*; *Heresie* is not charged usually on any, but either for *fundamentall errours*, or *obstinacie* in them. And though we commonly phrase *Schisme*, in matter of discipline, or circumstances of worship, and *Heresie* in matters of doctrine, yet, as we see by experience, those that begunne with Schismaticall separations, end too oft in Heresie: So a Schisme at first, if obstinately persisted in, may come to be Heresie,

resie, (for there is a doctrine of discipline in the Scripture) and a Schismatick wilfully defending his errour, though but in a matter of discipline, or other unnecessary opinions, may prove to be Heretick, & Heresie and Apostasie presupposeth Schisme. So that a man may be a Schismatick for raising the difference, and an Heretick in persisting in it. I shall lay the sinne of Apostasie, as most perhaps hereafter. Or may there not be Schisme in a matter of discipline, which is distinguished from worship. Surely the greatest Schisme at this day is found in discipline. As is evident, in the difference between Papist and us, subjection to the Pope: between Episcopall men and us, about submission to the Hierarchicall Governments, between the Presbyterians and Independents, where the administration of discipline lyes. And each party charge one another with Schisme, as hath ben in his following discourse. In doctrine and worship, the Independents some of them and we agree, having the same Confession of Faith, the same Ordinance of worship. The discipline only makes the Schisme, whereof who is most guiltie, will appear anone. Certaine it is,

on

on which party soever the charge falls, to be guilty of this crime, they will be found *to serve themselves carnal or to*

pag. 44. *have indulged to the flesh, and the corrupt*
*principles of Self, and their own Wills, &c.*

§. 11. But he professes, he could never yet meet with a definition of Schism, that did comprise, that was not exclusive of,

pag. 45. that, which alone, in the Scripture, is affirmed so to be. That shall be tryed by considering the *definitions* ordinarily given. The *definition* of *Austin* is this, *Schisma est dissidium congregationis*; when men of the same judgment in doctrine, and same rites in worship, delight in the discord of the Congregation. By *dissidium Congregationis*, the Dr. saies he means, A separation from the Church, into a peculiar Congregation. Which was the *case* of the *Donatists*, which he had then in hand.

But 1. this *definition* is just the Doctors *Dissidium Congregationis*, is not properly a *separation* from, but in the Church; and such was that of the *Donatists* at first; till, *refusing*, or receiving no satisfaction, they *separated* into other Congregations; and bid *defiance* to the Church; which is the common issue of

Acts 15. 39. such *intestine Divisions*. Paul and Barnabas

*nature*, two *holy*, *good* men, first fall into a *paroxysm* of contention, and presently *separated* and parted asunder.

2. *Basil*'s definition, is almost the same; who makes *Schism* to be a division arising from some Church controverses; and *συναγωγὰς ἰδίας*, to be the unlawful Conventicles, the ordinary *consequents* of such division; First, they *raise divisions*, that's the first degree of *Schism*, from *Schism* they fall into *Heresie*, the second degree; and then *separate into* new *conventions*, which is the highest Schism. Nor, because of later years, honest and pious *meetings* for Religion, were called *Conventicles*, and *Schism*, therefore may men conclude, that there is now no *Schism* in unlawful *Conventions* apart from a true Church, when it shall be determined so to be. pag. 46.

3. The Common definition given, 'That Schism is a causeless separation 'from the communion and worship of 'any true Church, &c. presupposes a *Division* in that *Church*, which *occasions* that separation, one party not being *satisfied* by the other. The *Crime* of which *separation*, must be taken, and judged by the *unjustness* of the cause thereof, which

cannot be in a *true Church*, but in those that *separate* from it. For if a Church, be either no *true Church*, or so extreamly *corrupted*, that a good *Christian* cannot hold *Communion* with it without *sin*, such a *separation* is no *Schism*, but they are the *Schismaticks*, who give the *cause* of that separation. But the *Reverend Doctor* is very large in his allowance of Separation; for he saies, 'Certain he is, that
pag. 46. 'a *separation* from some Churches, true,
'or pretended so to be, is commanded
'in the Scripture; so that the withdraw-
'ing from any Church, or society what-
'ever, upon the plea of its corruption, be
'it true or false, with a mind & resolu-
'tion to serve God in the due observati-
'on of Church institutions, according
'to that light which we have received,
'is no where called Schism, nor con-
'demned as a thing of that nature &c. If this be true, there will be found but litle or no Schism in any Church, or in the World. If a man may *lawfully separate* from a *true Church*, as well as from a *false*; and that upon a *false* plea of its *corruption*, as well as *true*, only with a *good mind* to serve God, in *Church institutions*, true, or *conceited* by his own *light*; all the Sectaries & Separatists, Donatists &

Brow-

*Brownists* in the world may be *justified*. But this will come again below; thither I shall remit the particular *scanning* of it.

Now lest (by the former indulgence) any should surmise, that he *complyes with them, that have slight and contemptible thoughts of Schism*, or to plead for his own Separation from our true Churches (as we are able to prove them) he will at present heighten the heinousnesse of Schism, when he hath first considered what aggravations, others have put upon it. § 12. p. 47.

1. Some say, it is 'a renting of the 'seamlesse coat of *Christ*, but (saies he) 'they seem to have mistaken their aim, 'and instead of aggravating, extenuated 'it: a rent of the body is not hightned, 'in its being called, the renting of a 'seamless *coat*. But this is but a *nicety*. I suppose they us'd it only by way of *allusion, à minore ad majus*. The *Souldiers* thought it not *wisdom* to divide that *seamlesse coat*, whereby it would be rendered *useless* to all; how much more *heinous* was it to rent his Body. The *Church* is called *Christs mystical* Body. Look then as it was an *heinous* thing to those *Souldiers* to divide his *seamless* coat, and much more to divide by *piercing* his §. 13. pag. 48.

natural body: so it is more hainous to *rent* his *body mystical*; which must needs reach to him the *Head*. This is the Apostles way of arguing, 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. *Is Christ divided?* q. d. Do you not by these *divisions*, divide and rent the *Body of Christ*? and does not *Christ* himself *suffer* in such divisions? But enough of that.

μεμέρισται *divided into parts.*

§ 14. *pag.* 49. 2. "It is usually said to be a sin a-"gainst Charity, as Heresie is against "Faith: but is Schism so a sin against "Charity? doth it supplant and root "out love out of the *Heart*? He means so, as *Heresie* does the *Faith*. But that's not the question: but whether *Schism* be not a *sinne* against *Charity*, as well (though not as much) as *Heresie* is a sin against *Faith*? And suppose it do not *root* out *Charity*, may it not *supplant*, or at least *suppress* & weaken it? may it not *interrupt* the exercise of the *duties* of love (as he said above *p.* 27.) "their Church "order, as to Love, Peace, Union, were "wofully disturbed with divisions, *&c.* And if *Schism* be *persisted* in, it may in the end *root* out *Charity*, and be inconsistent with it, as well as *Heresie* doth the *Faith*: Nor does every *Heresie* root out all *Faith*; a man may be an *Heretick* in

in one *Article*, and *Orthodox* in the Faith, in others. Yea, himself here confesses, "men by *Schism* are kept off "from the performance of any of those "offices, and duties of love, which are "useful, or necessary for the preservati- "on of the bond of perfection, and then "is it, or may in some sense, be said to "be a sin against *Love*. When the Apo- stle saies, that "*Love is the bond of per-* "*fection, because it preserves that perfect* "*and beautifull order amongst the Saints,* "*notwithstanding all hinderances and oppo-* "*sitions made by Schism*; He tells us ra- ther what true *love* is in it self, and ought to be in us, than what it is *mani- fested* to be in mens corrupt hearts, and conversations. They then that descri- bed it to be "*open breach of love*, aimed near, at the true *nature* it; which his *wa- ry consideration*, doth not excuse from *Schism*. For suppose it were possible "for a man to be all, and do all, that "those were and did, whom the Apostle "judges for *Schismaticks*, under the pow- "er of some violent temptation, and "yet have his heart full of love to the "Saints, to the communion disturbed by "him, which is very rare; Yet that person, who ever he be, could not be ex-

pag. 49.

*Divisions among them, breaches of Love:* so he, pag. 69. pag. 50.

cuſed from *Schiſm and a breach of charity*, any more than thoſe, whom the *Apoſtle* calls *Schiſmaticks*, who no doubt ſome of them, were under ſome *violent temptation*. It is again confeſſed, "It is "thus far a breach of love, in its own "nature, in that in ſuch men, Love can-"not exert it ſelf, in its utmoſt tenden-"cy, in wiſdom and forbearance for the "preſervation of order in the Church. If this had been ſaid at firſt, this had been enough to *aggravate* the *ſinfulneſſe* of *Schiſm*.

§ 15. pag. 50. 3. As for thoſe, who ſay, "*it is a re-*"*bellion againſt the Rulers of the Church*: if they mean it, in regard of their *Canons* and impoſition of unneceſſary Ceremonies *&c.* let them plead for themſelves. But if he mean, that *Schiſm* may be raiſed, againſt the *inſtituted Rulers* of the Church, walking in the *truths*, and *waies* of *Chriſt*, (as well as againſt any other *members* of the Church) it may be ſo far called *Rebellion* againſt the *Rulers* of the Church, as they that *deſpiſe Chriſts Embaſſadors*, deſpiſe Him alſo, the *miſchiefs* whereof, extend to the whole *Church*. And commonly the *Schiſm* begins againſt the *Rulers* of the Church; as that againſt *Moſes* and *Aaron* did: So that at

*Corinth*

Corinth in *Clements* time. This is too evident, at this time, That all the present *Schisms*, strike principally at the *Ministers* of the *Gospel*, All *Sects*, contending against them *primarily*, and reproaching of them, either as *Antichristian*, or as no *true Ministers* (besides worser names of *ignominie* and contempt) wherein the *Dr.* and his *party*, are not a little *guilty*, as will appear before we have done.

*He calls them Parochial Priests. pag. 235.*

Whether *Schismaticks* be *Church Members*, or no, is a question of no great concernment. The *Doctor* is peremptory "It is impossible a man should be a "Schismatick, unless he be a Church 'member. If he mean it of a member of the *Catholick* Church, its granted: for an *Heathen* cannot be a *Schismatick*. But if he mean (as I believe he does) no man can be *such*, unless he be a member of a *particular* Church, it is made appear to the contrary above, and shall be more hereafter. For the present I only say, Suppose a *Schismatick* of himself *departs* from the *Church*, or is *ejected* by the Church; yet still *persists* to maintaine the *differences* by him *raised*, in that Church; I desire to know, whether he ceases to be a *Schismatick*, because he is now no member of that Church, or is

§ 16. p. 51.

not still such, by the *Doctors* own *principles*? But too much of that.

§ 17. Upon the *Definition* of *Schism*, given by himself, "A causeless difference, or division, amongst the members of any particular *Church*, that meet or ought to "meet to the *worship* of God &c. he proceeds to deliver the *Aggravations* of the *sin* of *Schism*, wherein I shall agree with him fully; though not in his *definition*, in all particulars, as was said above. That, that is a *Schism* I confess, & contains a *part*, but not the whole *nature* thereof. For, as I believe, a *Schism* may be made in a *particular Church*, by one that is no *member* thereof, (*seducers* use to *creep* into houses and *Churches*, and *raise differences*). So I think, a *particular Church*, or some *members* of it, may make a Schism in & from the *Catholick* Church, or other particular *Churches*, which shall be capable of those *aggravations* by him given. Look as in the *body natural*, here may be supposed a *Schism*, amongst the *fingers* of either *hand*, whereof they are the more *immediate members*, which yet may truly be said, to be a *Schism*, in relation to the *whole body*, which hath *influence* into, and *interest* in those *members*, and shall suffer not a little by their *divi-*

*pag. 52. Is not this a mans definition, & the strength of it this? such an act is Schisme, therefore none else is: See p. 44.*

*sions*:

*sions*: So it is in the *body mystical*, though the *divisions* immediatly disturb the *particular Church*, where they *arise*, yet they also reach to the *disquiet*, and danger of the next *Congregations*, and then of the *whole Church*, "*A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*. A *mutinie* begun in a single *troop*, hath been the ruin of the whole *Army*. The *Design* (however *disclaimed* p. 47. f.) I fear is this. This *definition* of *Schism* is forelaid, and so oft *repeated* to prevent the *charge* thereof, upon *himself* and his own *select congregation*. If they have but so much *wit*, or so much *grace*, as either not to *raise*, or not to *discover* any *causelesse differences* amongst themselves, though they *separate* from, and *disturbe* the *peace* and *union* of the whole *national Church*, or all the *Churches* of a Nation, they are by no means to be styled *Schismaticks*. But more of this, in *Hypothesi*, when he comes to *apply* it to themselves.

Whether the *Church* of *Rome*, is a *Church* of *Christ*, or no, and how they are *Schismatical*; I list not to be their *Advocate*, they are old enough, to answer his *charge* themselves. I think he hath said enough (if not too much) to vindicate the *Protestant Churches* from *Schism*, in §. 18. *pag.* 56.

in their *separation* from *Rome*. But his *principle* will carry him further, not only to *unchurch Rome*, but also all *Protestant Churches*, at home and abroad, for want (as he thinks) of a *right constitution* by *Jesus Christ*: as well as to free himself and his from the *crime* of *Schism*: as will presently appear. Only I observe that he does not charge *Rome* it self to be *Schismatical*, but upon *supposition*, that it is a *Church*; (which he denies below) then indeed, by her *intestine divisions*, she is the most *schismatical* Church in the world; but if *no Church*, not *schismatical*; whereas our *Divines*, have proved her *schismatical*, not only by her *intestine differences* but chiefly by her *schismatical principles*, as those above *mentioned*, That she is the *Catholick Church*, and none out of her *Communion*, are any better than *Heretick*s, or Heathens. That *Ordination* is void, except done by her *Bishops*; and also, and especially, by her *abominable corruptions*, *doctrine*, and worship, departing therein from the *Scriptures*, and example of the *Apostolical* Churches. Now his *chief*, if not only *principle*, to conclude himself not *schismatical*, in *separating* from *Rome*, is this, "That "there was never any such thing, as that

*Our Conventicles are no Churches, but sties of beasts p. 63. say they.*

*pag.* 60.

"which

which is called the Church of *Rome*, instituted in reference to the worship of God by Jesus Christ, which he hereafter affirms also of *National*, and *Presbyterian* Churches; as he thereby *frees* himself from *Schism*, in *separating* from all Churches in the world: So he therewith *unchurcheth* all our *Churches*, as well as *Rome*.

For so he saies; "upon the same prin- § 19.
"ciple, a plea for freedom from the pag. 64.
"charge of any Church, really, or pre-
"tended, as National, may be founded
"and confirmed. That *principle* is the *de-*
*finition* of Schism before given; "Schism
"is an evil amongst the members of a
"Church. And hence he inferred a-
gainst the Church of *Rome*; "If our own
"Congregations be not Churches, what-
"soever we are, we are not *Schismaticks*.
And against them that plead for a Nati-
onal Church, and charge them with
*Schism* for separating from it, he saies
again; "If we are not of the National
"Church, (as they protest they are not) pag. 67.
"whatever we are, we are not *Schisma-*
"*ticks*. And this will once more be
made use of, against the charge of Schism,
in separating from our present Churches;
as we shall see below. But he makes a

*Dilemma*

*Dilemma*, and thinks it both waies unanswerable, "either we are of the Na-"tional Church of *England*, or we are "not. If not, whatever we are, we are "not *Schismaticks*. If we are, and must "be of it, whether we will or no, being "made so, we know not how, &c. shew "us then, what office of Love is incum-"bent on us, that we do not perform. His *arguing* is not *distinct*, having not yet told us what he means by a *National Church*. If he take it, (as he seems to do) for the *Hierarchical Church*, with *National Officers*, with subordinations, &c. I would say, Its certain, himself was once of that *National Church*, a *member* of it, perhaps zealous of *Episcopacy*, and an *exact observer* of its *Canons*; So that, if that *National Church* be proved (as it is by some attempted) to be a *Church* of *Christs institution*, he cannot be excused from *Schism* in *separating* from it. For though they cannot charge him, as now, of that Church, both it *being abolished*, and himself *changed* into another way, yet they may say, he was not long since, a *member* of that *National Church*. But if he take *National Church*, as the *Churches* were in the *Nation*, all *professing* the same truth, and *exercising* the

the same *substantial worship*, (as the most Orthodox understood *England* to be a *National* Church) he must either acknowledge himself to be still a member of this *National Church*, (as he does *pag.* 224.) or else *renounce communion* with her also as no *Church*, or *Churches* of *Christ*: which whether he does or no, comes after to be considered.

For the other *horn* of his *Dilemma*, §. 20.
"If they are, and must be of this Natio-
"nal Church &c. what duty of Love is
"there, which they owe to it, and do
"not perform? Seeing he makes the *challenge*, and professes, "that if it can
"be shewn, he will address himself to it. I shal take the pains to inform him fully, before we have done; only now considering what he saies here. "Do we not
"(saies he) joyn in external acts of wor- p. 67.
"ship, in peace, with the whole Church?
"Call the whole Church together, & try
"what we will do? Is not all this *aquivocally* spoken? In what *external acts of worship*, do they joyn with us, as a *Church*? Do they not disown us, as no *Churches*? and our *Ministers* as no *Ministers*? & admit none to *worship* with them, but *confederate* members? When they sometimes *preach* in our Congregations, or *hear* us *preach*,

do

do they not count themselves to us, and us to themselves, as *gifted brethren* only, but no *Ministers*? And what means he by the *whole Church*? or how can it be called together? unless he mean his own Church, or Churches. How then do they *joyn* in every Congregation in the *Nation*? When (though they *presume* to preach in our Churches, to *steal* away our people from us) their *own people* will seldome or never come into our *Congregations* to hear, unless *some of them preach*. *Ad populum phaleras*. And as for their *joyning* in *peace*, with the whole Church, it is a *Blind*: for they *separate* themselves with some of our *members*, from our *Churches*, to the great *discouragement* of the *Ministers*, and greater *disturbance* of the whole, and all the *Churches* of the Nation.

§. 21. pag. 70, The *Counsel* that he gives "to members of particular Churches, who have "voluntarily given up themselves, to "walk in them, according to the appointment of Jesus Christ, I fear, *extends* no further than to his *formed* and confederate Churches, That they would be *careful* to prevent *causeless differences*, in their own *meetings*, or among themselves; which if they do, let them all

say

say what they will, they are no *Schismaticks*. For as for our *particular* Congregations, they scarce account them *Churches*, though most of the members of them, "have voluntarily given up themselves explicitely, or implicitely (as "New England men confesse) to walk "in them, according to the appointment "of Jesus Christ. And if they grant ours to be *true Churches*, they must necessarily acknowledge, those who first *raised* causeless *differences* in them, & now *foment* them by *separation* from them, to be *Schismaticks*, by his own *description*. Yea so much worse, than those *Corinthians*, whose case he *exemplifies*, if so be they did not upon their *differences*, separate into *parties* and *Churches*, (which he denies, but we conceive they did) and *these* both *raise differences*, and then *separate* from our Churches, into several *combinations*; and one sayes, I am of *Pauls* Congregation, and another, I am of *Apollo's*, I speak this in a *figure*, as *Paul* did. He can easily apply it. 1 *Cor.* 4. 6.

CHAP.

## CHAP. III.

### *Causeless Separation from a true Church is Schism.*

§ 1. HE now fearing this or the like *Objection*, (as *obvious* to be made by
pag. 72. every man) "That if Schism be only a-
"mongst the members of one Church,
"then the separation of any man or
men, from a true Church, or one Church
"from another, is not *Schism*; which is
contrary to the judgement of most *Christians*, *Divines*, and *Churches*: he hopes
to help himself by his old *definition* of
*Schism*, in the Scripture *precise* description of it, as he limited above: And *peremptorily* denies, that "In that sense,
pag. 73. "there is any relinquishment, departure, or separation from any Church, or
"Churches, mentioned or intimated in
"the Scripture, which is, or is called
"Schism, or agreeth with the description
"by them given us, of that term. But to
this, I have many things to say. 1. That
*precise signification* of the word, and *description* of the thing is before disproved.
The word properly signifies a *separation* of a Body into *parts*, and is applyed both
to *political* and *Ecclesiastical* Bodies in
the Scripture; as was proved above.

2. Sup-

2. Supposing that to be the *onely sense* mentioned in the case of the *Corinthians* (which is denyed and disproved) yet may another sense be *intimated* in Scripture, and *deduced* by *regular* and rationall consequence. The word signifying indefinitely *seperation*, either in *opinion*, or *parts*, is it not a faire consequence? "If seperation in judgement "in a Church, be a Schisme, much more "upon that difference, to separate from "a Church, into another against the "*Church*. 3. St. *John* blames some for *separating* from the Church, 1 *Joh.* 2, 19. *they went out from us, &c*: as is the manner of *Schismaticall* and *Heretical* Spirits: being *obstinate* in their *opinions*, and opposed by the *Church*, they stay not, till they are *cast out*, but go out, and become the *head* of a *faction*, against the Church: as *histories* do abundantly manifest. 4. His own places brought for instances of *blameable separation* from a Church do all or some minde the *nature* of *Schisme*, as *precedaneous* to that separation; therefore this sense is *intimated* in the Scripture, we shall consider them in order.

§. 2. 1. The first produced, is *Heb.* 10. 25. "not forsaking the Assembling of our "selves together, as some do: He renders the words (for his own advantage) "not wholly deserting the Assembling "of our selves, &c: and makes it to p. 74. be "Apostacie from the faith, and there- "upon forsaking the Assemblies: would any man call these *Schismaticks*, sayes hee?

*He formerly glossed this text, of neglecting the publick Assemblyes onely: see Appendix.* §. 14.

He makes the context to be with the 26. *v.* that so he may draw it to Apostacie, they departed to *Judaism*; but it rather looks back to the 24. *v.* Let us consider one another to provoke unto love & good works, which is the fruit of brotherly watchfullnesse in members of a Congregation; *Mat.* 18. 15. μὴ ἐγκαλαπολείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, not forsaking the assembling, &c: but forsaking another, *q. d.* If we forsake the assemblyes of the Church, we shall quickly neglect that brotherly mutuall care and inspection of one another, and so fall into separation or Apostacie. And the 26 *v.* rather referres to the latter end of the 25. *v.* but exhorting one another so much the rather, as you see the day approaching: For if we sinne willingly, &c: If we forsake the assemblyes

blyes, neglecting brotherly inspection; and so fall into Schism, or Apostacie; (from one to the other) the end will be dreadfull.

But first, the Latine Interpreters expound it, of *forsaking* the Assemblyes; either by *Schism* or *Apostacie*. 2. Apostacie is *graduall*, either *partiall* in some point of Faith; or *totall* in all; the first may proceed to a *Schism* in the Church; the second to a *separation* from the Church. As those, *Act.* 15. that in part forsook the *way* of the Gospell, and joyned *Moses* with *Christ*, circumcision with baptism, are said *to goe out from* the Apostles, *v.* 24. "Certaine, that "went out from us, have troubled you "with words: These were *Schismaticks* in the one, and *Apostates*, or *Separatists* in the other. An *Heretick* or an *Apostate* may be a *Schismatick*, and something more; as a *Schismatick* too often proves an *Heretick*. For when *Seducers* have first *raised divisions* in a Church, they either *voluntarily forsake* it, or are justly *ejected* by the Church, and then *gather* their Disciples into distinct bodyes, in *opposition* to the Church as said above. Thus Apostle describes them thus, *Act.* 20. 30. "Of your

*Estius in loc.*

"own selves shall men arise, speaking "perverse things to draw away disciples "after them. These are *grievous Wolves*, *v.* 23. so farre from taking *care* of the flock, that they *rent* and *teare* it, not sparing the flock. And therefore the Apostle joynes these together, 1 *Cor.* 12. 25. "That there should be no "Schism in the body, but that the "members should have the same "care one for another: Implying that where there is a *Schism*, in the Church, the members neglect the *care* one of another; and when the members neglect the care one of another, there's a *Schism* in the Church. But if they so farre neglect the *care* of one another, as to *seperate* from the Church, that's an *higher degree* of Schism, even a *double Schism*. As in the *body naturall*; if it be a *Schism*, for one member to *rent* and teare another, *in the* body, much more to *rend* and *divide* themselves *from* the body, when they cannot have any *care* one of another. Wee see this exemplifyed at this day: When men have first *raised divisions* in the Church, they *seperate* from the Church, and *gather* themselves into *distinct* bodies, having no *care* for the body from whence they seperated,

rather

scarce owning them for *Churches*, but rather account them *no true Churches*, *reproaching* and reviling them; Are not these *Schismaticks*.

2. The second place, for *blameable separation*, is "of some, who withdraw "themselves from Church-communion, "at least for a season by their disorderly "and irregular walking. 1 *Thes.* 5. 14. "ἀτάκτους, and ἀτάκτως, 2 *Thes.* 3. 2. 6. "Such there were in the primitive "times, and in our dayes, whom we "charge not with Schism, but vanity, "folly, and disobedience to the precepts "of Christ, in generall. No mervail these are not charged with *Schism*; for they neither *raised divisions* in the Church, nor *separated* from the Church but were *disorderly* and *irregular* out of the Church, in *neglect* of their *callings*; So the Apostle expresly instances, 2 *Thes.* 3. 11. "wee heare that there "are some which walk among you dis-"orderly, not working at all, but are "busybodies. They did not *separate* from the Church, but rather (as *some* now do) made their *frequenting* of *publick* meetings and exercises, the *Cloake* for their *idlenesse*; thinking the *Church* was bound to maintaine them. They

§. 3. p. 75.

were so farre from *separating* from the Church, that some (who bring, *v.* 14. for *excommunication*) think, the Apostle commands the Church to *separate* them, (if they upon warning, mend not this fault) from the Societie. Others think that he commands them onely to *withdraw* from them, in *civill* respects, and if they will not *labour*, let them *starve*, *v.* 10. As for those ἄτακτοι, in the 2d verse, which he calls "persons that a-"bide quietly in no place, or station; it is supposed they were not the same men but *persecutors* of the Apostle, most *absurdly* and unreasonably: He knows ἄλογοι is a *Logicall* terme; signifying absurd men, that know not the *Topicks*, or heads of reasoning; and these are joyned with *wicked* and faithlesse men. However, the Apostle commanding them to *warne* those *disorderly men as brothers*, by no meanes can be suspected, to *charge* them for *separation*. Yet if he will needs understand it of their *separation* from Church *communion*, we shall charge them, not only with *vanity*, *folly*, *disobedience*, but also with *Schism*. For they might stirre up *dissensions* in the Church, by *defence* of their idlenesse (which himself calls *Schism*) and then *separate* from the Church: but enough of that.

3. "Men

3. "Men also separated themselves, §. 4.
"upon sensualitie, that they might free- p. 76.
"ly indulge to their lusts, and live in all
"manner of pleasure all their dayes,
"*Jude* 19. *v.* These are they that sepe-
"rate themselves, *&c*: That some men do *seperate* from the Church, upon *doctrines of Libertie* and licentiousnesse, is too evident, as in the *old Gnosticks*, so in the *late Ranters*, and *Family* of Love; but no doubt these men maintained their *opinions* and practises in the *Church*, so long as they could, which caused *divisions* in the Church, and so were *Schismaticks*: and after separated into their own *abominable meetings*, as the world knows. That the Apostle spake of the *same* men in the 4, 7, 8, 10, verses, and in the 19. verse, is not probable, for those *former* did not *separate* from the Church, (or were not then *separated*) for he speaks of them as *frequenters* of the *Assemblyes*, *v.* 12. "These are spots in your feasts
"of charitie, when they feast with you;
"feeding themselves without feare. These *Agapæ*, *Love feasts*, were kept in their *Church-meetings*, at the *Sacrament*; therefore they were not *separated*. And as for the 19. verse, its the *judgment* of

learned *Divines*, it imports just the *nature* of *seducers*, who *draw disciples* after them, out of the Church. The word used to denote this *separation* is ἀποδιοπίζουσι, which, *Oecumenius* sayes, comes from διὸς and signifies, *extra terminos ecclesiæ quempiam educere, elicere*, to *lead*, or *draw* men out of the Church: and so implyes, they did not onely *separate* themselves, but *drew* others also into *seperation*. And *Clem. Alexandr.* interprets it, *segregantes fideles à fidelibus, id est, alios ab aliis*: Seperating the *faithfull from the faithfull* that is, some *members* of the Church from other: In a word, others understand it of both kinds of *separation, tam in doctrina, quam in cœtibus*; in *opinions* and parties, or assemblyes. And both these being *causelesse divisions*, are by all accounted *Schisms*. Now the reverend Doctor, to avoid this, calls these *Abominations*, and not Schisms, and askes, "whether "the men of these abominations are to "be accounted Schismaticks, or their "crime, in separating, *Schisms*? But this is but a *disguise* of the businesse; For there may be *Schism* in this (and the other two afore) and *something more*. He that *raises* dissentions in a Church, and then

p. 27.

*As Anabaptists, Quakers, &c: do not cease to be Independents, but a ethat, and some thing more.*

then *separates* from it, either by *Apostacie, Idlenesse*, or *sensualitie*, carryes his brand of a *Schismatick* with him; though it seeme to be *swallowed* up, in *further abominations*. There are degrees of *Schism*, (as I said) which are not *denominated* from the *terminus ad quem*, the *wickednesse* that such proceed unto; but from the *terminus à quo*, that is from a *true Church*. I shall put him a case; If a *member* of his Congregation, inclining to *Apostacie, Idlenesse*, or *sensuality* should first *raise* divisions in his Church, concerning any of those, and then should *seperate* from his Church, either into *irregular walking*, as some *Antinomians*, or into *Abhominations*, as some *Ranters*, or into totall *Apostacie* and *Atheism*, which many are *fallen* into, from the *height* of this way; would he not say these were *Schismaticks* and something *worse*? And of all it may be said, "These are they that separate themselves: I leave it to him.

But he is so confident of the contrary, §. 5.
that he redoubles more vigourously, his
former Assertion. "I say, for a man to p. 77.
"with-draw, or with-hold himself from
"the Communion externall and visible
of

"of any Church, or Churches, on the "pretenſion and plea, be it true or o-"therwiſe, that the worſhip, doctrine, "diſcipline inſtituted by Chriſt, is cor-"rupted among them, with which cor-"ruption he dares not *defile* himſelfe, "it is no where, in the Scripture called "Schiſm, *&c.* Before I come to *ſcanne* the words in particular, I ſhall ſay, in generall, this is a *fallacious*, becauſe an *ambiguous*, aſſertion. For 1. He tells not whether a man may *ſeparate*, when there is *corruption* in ſome one of theſe onely, or in all of them. 2. Nor how far *ſome* or all of theſe, muſt be *corrupted*, before we may *ſeparate*. 3. All theſe were as much corrupted (and more) in the *Jewiſh Church*, as in ours, (when he and his *partie ſeparated* from us) and yet our *Saviour* and his *Apoſtles* continued their *Communion* with it: and the Church of *Corinth*, in all theſe, was as much and more *corrupted*, than ours, yet the *Apoſtle* mentions, no ſeparating from it: 4. He now requires that it be *called* Schiſme in Scripture; when as before, he ſaid, if it had the *nature* of it, it was *ſufficient*. 5. If a bare *Plea* againſt corruptions, *true or falſe*, may warrant a *ſeparation*, then the moſt *rigid* ſepe-

*seperatists* may be, and are by him *acquitted* from Schism; as I said above. But more particularly; He hath not rightly *stated* the question, as now it lyes between us: which is not of a single mans *secession* from a true Church, a *particular Congregation*; to joyne himselfe to another *Church*, of the same *Constitution*, where he may enjoy (as he thinks) the *Ordinances* more *purely*, or more *profitably*. For it was ever lawfull for a man to *remove* his *habitation*, and to joyne himselfe to such a *Congregation*. But the *pinch* of the question is, "whether a man, or a company "of men, may separate from a true "Church, upon a plea of corruption in "it, true or false, set up another Church, "as to all Ordinances, renouncing that "Church, to be a true Church. And so much the *worse* and more *Schismaticall* is that *separation*, from a true *Church*, when either those *men* that separate, have not done those *duties* incumbent on them, to *reforme* it; or that Church is upon a *Resolution* and *endeavour*, to reforme it selfe according to the *Rule* of the Gospell. This is plainly our case at present, with the Doctor and his *Associates*.

But

§. 6. p. 78. But he further affirmes; "Of one "Church particular, departing from "that communion with another, or o-"thers, be it what it will, which it "ought to hold, unlesse in the departing "of some of them, in some things, from "the common Faith, which is suppo-"sed not to relate to Schism, in the "Scripture we have no example. The more *happie* were those times, that they yeelded no such example. But if they did not, yet if they give us an example of one Church, divided upon *differences*, into severall Congregations, or to some Ordinances (as we proved they do) they come very neere the case of *Schism* before us: And himselfe hath granted that upon *supposition* that *Rome* is a (particular) Church (as opposed to the *Catholick*) she in the most *Schismaticall* Church in the world, not onely in regard of her own *inward divisions* (as he) but also in her *separation* from the *Apostolicall primitive Church*, in doctrine, worship and discipline (as our Divines do maintaine) upon this account it was that the *Divines* of the *Assembly* said: "To leave all ordinary communion in "any Church, with dislike, where oppo-"sition, or offence offers it selfe, is to

See p. 141

sepa-

"seperate from such a Church, in the "Scripture sense; though they adde, "such separation was not in being in "the Apostles time. His exception to this, is frivolous, "How they came to "know exactly the sense of the Scripture "in and about things not mentioned in "them, I know not. The reconciliation is ease; In the *Apostles* time, or in that case of the *Corinthians*, (such was their happinesse) there was no separation of one Church from another, in that high manner, as after they did; but yet the Scripture gives a faire ground, by way of *consequence*; there and in other places, above named, to conclude, that if *separation* in a *Church*, in *opinions* and judgement, be a *Schism*, much more *separation* from a true Church by persons, or Churches, leaving all ordinary communion with it, with dislike or opposition, is to be accounted Schism; especially if they first depart from the *common Faith*, and then, upon that *difference*, separate from the Church. And therefore, though he be *unwilling*, I shall not doubt but to be able "*to compell him* to "carry on the notion of Schism, further than yet he hath done. pag. 79.

But

§. 6. p. 78. But he further affirmes; "Of one "Church particular, departing from "that communion with another, or o-"thers, be it what it will, which it "ought to hold, unlesse in the departing "of some of them, in some things, from "the common Faith, which is suppo-"sed not to relate to Schism, in the "Scripture we have no example. The more *happie* were those times, that they yeelded no such example. But if they did not; yet if they give us an example of one Church, divided upon *differences*, into severall Congregations, as to some Ordinances, (as we proved they do) they come very neere the case of *Schism* before us: And hitherto hath granted that upon *supposition* that *Rome* is a (particular) Church (as opposed to the *Catholick*) she is the most *Schismaticall* Church in the world, not onely in regard of her own *irreligious divisions* (as he) but also in her *separation* from the *Apostolicall primitive Church*, in doctrine, worship and discipline (as our Divines do maintaine) upon this acount it was, that the *Divines* of the *Assembly* said: "To leave all ordinary communion in "any Church, with dislike, where oppo-"sition, or offence offers it selfe, is to

See p. 141

sepa-

"seperate from such a Church, in the "Scripture sense; though they adde, pag. 79.
"such separation was not in being in "the Apostles time. His exception to this, is frivolous, "How they came to "know exactly the sense of the Scripture "in and about things not mentioned in "them, I know not. The reconciliation is ease; In the *Apostles* time, or in that case of the *Corinthians*, (such was their happinesse) there was no separation of one Church from another, in that high manner, as after they did; but yet the Scripture gives a faire ground, by way of *consequence*; there and in other places, above named, to conclude, that if *separation* in a *Church*, in *opinions* and judgement, be a *Schism*, much more *separation* from a true Church by persons, or Churches, leaving all ordinary communion with it, with dislike or opposition, is to be accounted Schism; especially if they first depart from the *common Faith*, and then, upon that *difference*, separate from the Church. And therefore, though he be *unwilling*, I shall not doubt but to be able "*to compell him* to "carry on the notion of Schism, further than yet he hath done.

But

§. 7. But that he may shew his *skill* and *gratifie* his Adversaries, he will carry on this discourse to a *fuller issue*, according to the common definition of *Schism*; "That it is a breach of union, onely he will put in "a reasonable *postulatum*, "that this union be an union of the ap- "pointment of Jesus Christ, which I shall freely grant him; provided he do not limit *Schism*, as formerly he did, to the *worship* of God only: yet that he does here againe; "The consideration "of what sort of union, in reference to "the worship of God (marke that) is "instituted by Jesus Christ, is the foun- "dation of what I have further to offer, &c: The *Designe* of this is, that he may have a *faire retreat*, when he is charged with *breach of union*, in other respects, and so with *Schisme*, to escape by this *evasion*; "This breach of union, is not "in reference to the worship of God, in "one Assembly, met to that end. And that is onely *Schisme* in the Scripture *notion*; as he hath often told. But I shall attend his *method*.

§. 8. "This union being instituted in the "Church, according to the various ac- "ceptions of that word, so it is distin- "guished

"guished: For which purpose he under-
takes three things, to shew. 1. "The
"severall considerations of the Church,
"with which union is to be preserved.
"2. What that union is, we are to keep p. 82.
"with the Church, in each consideration.
"3. How that union is broken,
"and what the sinne whereby it is done.
Wherein we shall follow him as farre as
we are *concerned*, leaving others to plead
for themselves.

## CHAP. IV.

### *Of the Church* Catholick *Mysticall, and its Union.*

THe Church of Christ in this world, §. 1.
is taken in Scripture three wayes,
"1. For the mysticall body of Christ, p. 84.
"his elect & redeemed, & is commonly
"called the Church Catholick militant,
"2. For the universalitie of men, call-
"ed by the Word, visibly professing the
"Gospell, called the Church Catholick
"visible. 3. For a particular Church
"of some place, wherein the instituted
"worship

"worship of God in Christ, is celebra-
"red according to his mind. This di-
stinction of the *Church*, is rather of the
word, than of the thing intended by it;
& imports not a three-fold Church, but
one Church under a threefold *consideration*:
"arising (as he sayes) from the
"nature of the things themselves; that
is, the *members* of that Church, who
may be considered; either *as true believers*,
that makes the *invisible* Church, 2,
as *professors* of the same Faith, & that
makes the *Catholike visible* Church: or
thirdly as *partakers* of the same *instituted*
worship, and that is called a particular
Church: For, as the definition of a
Church agrees to it, in all the three
considerations; "It is a *societie* of men
"called out of the world, by the word,
"&c: So, the same persons are or may
be *members* of all the three *Churches*, or
in that *threefold* consideration of it, at
once. He that is a true *believer* of the
*invisible* Church, is also a *professor* of the
Faith, and so a member of the *Catholike*
visible Church, and he that is of both
those, is or ought to be (if possible) a
*member* of a particular Church: Now
the *Church*, having its rise and *nature*
from a *call*, (as the word imports) that
*call* admitting of severall *degrees*, causes

this

This three fold notion of the Church, That call in Scripture, is either *internall*, which he calls *effectuall*; or *externall*, and that again admits of degrees: men are called either to the *profession* of Faith onely (lacking opportunity of publick Ordinances) or to *participation* of the instituted worship also: In their *obedience* to the first call, they are said to be members of the *Church invisible*; to the second, to be members of the *Catholick Visible*; to the third, to be members of a *particular Church*. And his *own way* of tying the former distinction, is the same for substance, p. 84, §. 2. Hence the *necessity* of *Churches* in the last *acception* is not onely, because members of a particular Church, *are bound to externall rules for joynt communion* (for to those very *rules*, are members of the *invisible* and visible Church *bound* also, where it is possible); but partly because, the *Catholick Church*, in either sense cannot all meet in one place; and partly because the *opportunitie* to yeeld *obedience* to those rules of joynt *communion* cannot be *enjoyed* but in a particular *Society*, not too great or *numerous*.

§. 2. 1. For his first consideration of the Church, which he calls the Mysticall

page 84. "body of Christ, but leaves out the Catholike visible Church: Catholike mindes I have but a little to say. I observe only, first that he restraines the Catholick Church visible, only to this world as militant; whereas comonly Divines take it for the whole number of the elect, both Militant and Triumphant, from Heb. 12. 23. "The generall assembly, "and Church of the first borne, which are "written in heaven. 2. That he makes the Church invisible the onely Mysticall body of Christ, which is ordinarily applyed to the Catholike visible Church also, as contradistinguished to the civill or politicall body of Saints.

See my Vind. Vind. p. 9. 3. That he cites Heb. 12. 23. to prove the Catholike visible Church, which is commonly understood of the Catholike visible Evangelicall Church, He saies;

page 88. "They that will apply this (text) to the "Church in any other sense, must know "that it is indeed a peculiar priviledge "bestowed upon the Church militant, "every one that is a true member of the "Church, in this sense, which will be "difficult, &c: But I say, that the pro-mise in that text, (and the rest cited), is

made

made good to every one that is a true member of the *invisible* Church, is true; They are built upon that Rock, and the gates of Hell shall never prevaile against them; but yet it may be true, (with respect (if not to a *particular* Church, which may faile, yet) to the *Catholike visible* Church, which as it is built upon that Rock, the *confession* of *Peter*, *that Jesus Christ is the Sonne* of God, and the *visible* creed; So it is to continue to the worlds end, and the gates of Hell shall not prevaile *totally* to destroy it. And this himselfe confesses, "I no way "doubt of the perpetuall existence of "innumerable believers in every age, "and such as made the profession, that "is absolutely necessary to salvation, one "way or other, p. 86. f. There is then a *perpetuall existence* of the Church, not *onely invisible*, as true *believers*, but allowd the *visible*, as *professors* of the Faith of the Gospell; and so the promise is made good to it. Indeed the *promise* in that text, is made to the *whole Church* indefinitely, and respectively; but not to every *particular* person in it, nor to every *particular* Church: There shall be a *Church* of true believers and professors of the Faith in all ages, but whe-

ther it be made to a particular Church, as Christ hath had always a Church in this sense in the world, himselfe saying so, a *needlesse enquiry*, p. 85. §. 3. Of which more perhaps hereafter.

§. 3. The second thing considerable is, the *Union* of the members of this *Catholicke invisible* Church, among themselves; which he makes to be; "The Inhabita-
pag. 95. "tion of the same Spirit, or the anima-
"tion of the whole by the Spirit; this
"is the fountaine radicall union of this
"Church, in it selfe, and with its head
"with the formall reason of it. But he cannot but know, that some of his *own way*, make *Faith* it selfe; in all the single
D. Amef. Mcedull. l. 1, c. 31. §. 21. *believers*, to be the forme of this invisible Church; which they call the *state essentiall* of this Church; they meane, the *essence of the Church* is preserved by *Faith*, in single *believers*: but I contend not: Be it *Faith*, or the *Spirit* of Faith, in its graces and operations, the matter is not great. But besides this *radicall union*, he makes a *double consequentiall*
pag. 96. *union* flowing from that. "1. of Faith
"2. of Love, of all those united in the
"head, towards one another, and of
"every

"every one towards the whole. But
these are improperly called *unions*; they
are rather *consequents* of that union by
one Spirit, than consequentiall unions: and rather are the *names* of com-
munion, Faith with the Head, Love
with the members; So he sayes still pag. 98.
"I cannot say, they have their union in
"themselves by Love, but it is the next
"immediate principle of that communion,
"which they have one with another, &c.
but I list not to strive about this neither.
The third thing is, to enquire where-
in the *breach of this union* must consist:
"In these two things? 1. The casting pag. 99.
"out that Spirit, which gives this union;
"2. The losse of Love, flowing from thence
"into the body of Christ, &c. concern-
ing which, he tells his Adversaries,
"That our perswasion is, that this union pag. 100.
"was never utterly broken by any men,
"even into it, or ever shall be, to the end
"of the world. I shall not differ with
him, in this *Assertion*? Onely I take
no ice of the *wariness* of his expression;
(*utterly broken*) which in this *debate*,
signifies *totally* and *finally*. But if I
may *gradually* and for *a time* be *inter-*
*preted*, (as our Divines allow) may there
not be said to be a *breach* in *that union*,

though not of *that union*? And consequencially a *breach* in *this union* by some sin may be called, *Schisme*; which he too slightingly disavows. That *Faith* may be weakened, and *Love* remitted, there is no question; and that the Spirit may be *quenched*, and *grieved*, the Scripture insinuates; upon which *offence*, there may be a kind of *Schisme*, even in the *Invisible Church*, if not to a *separation* of the Spirit utterly, yet to a *suspension* of its influence, by hiding it selfe, and leaving the *Believer* to a sad *desertion*; as experience tells us. Besides this, the *members* of this Church, being also *visible* in another sense, and so of the *Catholike visible Church*; may there not be a *breach* of *union*, even among them, which may extend, not onely to *divisions* in judgment, but also to *separation* into parties, and what is that but *Schisme*? I gave an instance in *Paul* and *Barnabas*, both members of this Church; *Act.* 15. last; and members of no *particular Church*. But strictly to speak, This *Church* it selfe, and its *union* being both *invisible*, *quæ electi*, there can be no *visible breach of union* in it, or among the members of it; and so we must look for *Schisme*, in the other Notions of the Church. Chap.

## CHAP. V.

### Of the Church Catholick visible, and its Unity.

THe next whereof is, the *Catholick visible Church*, which he describes to be, "The universality of men pro- "fessing the doctrine of the Gospel, and "obedience to God in Christ, through- "out the World. These he grants, do constitute the *visible Kingdom* of Christ, and so may be called his *Church*: but whether *precisely, so called in Scripture*, (he saies) is not a *questionable*: But to me and others (whom he may do well to satisfie) this is out of *question*. He makes the question to be, "what relati- "on it stands in, to all particular Chur- "ches, whether as a Genus to its Spe- "cies; or as a *Totum* to its parts. And he seems to be Negative in both. His gene- ral reason is, because "The universal "visible Church we speak of, is not a "thing that hath, as such, a specificative "form, from which it should be so cal- "led, as a particular hath for its ground "of being so called. That shall be tryed, when we hear what is the *specificative*

§. 1.

p. 112.

p. 113.

form of a particular Church. In the mean time, let us consider why he denies this Catholick Church to be in relation to the particular Churches as a Genus to its Species; "because this would deprive "every one of membership in this uni- "versal Church, which is not joyned "actually to some particular Church, "which is devoid of truth. What force there is in this consequence against them of *New England*, who make particular Churches to be *Species* of the *universal* Church, as (say they) *several drops* of water, are *Species* of water; and also make a man first a *member* of a particular Church, before he can be a *member* of the *Catholick*, I say, what force there is, in this consequence against them, I do not see; I only note his *disagreement* with them; though I agree with him in the thing. For the other, That *particular* Churches are *parts* of the *Catholick*, he also denies, because, "this were to "overthrow a remarkable difference "between the Oeconomy of the old Te- "stament and the New, to parts & mem- "bers of any Catholick Church, as that it "should be constituted or made up of "them, or by them, for the order and "purpose of an instituted Church, for

*Mr. Hooker's Survey.*

*p.* 113.

wor-

worship of God he means, as the worship of God was National among the Jewes? But (besides what others have said to prove the *Catholick Church*, to be a *Political* Church, in a candid sense) I would say, the *Ceremonial* worship only (or chiefly) was *National*; the *moral* worship was performed in several *Congregations*, or *Synagogues*, (wherein there were *Rulers* and *ruled*) and yet those might be called *parts* of the *Jewish* Church, as a *Totum*, or whole. And why *particular* Churches may not be called *parts* of the *Catholick* (which is but the *National* Church enlarged) I yet see no reason. That all the *members* of the *Catholick Church* should meet together, to *hear one Sermon*, to *partake* of one *Sacrament*, &c. as it was possible once, when their *number* was but an 120. *Acts* 1. so they are *bound* still, but that the *multitude* makes it impossible. That the *particular Congregations* should joyn together, in the same *specifical Ordinances*, and have *Officers* over them *alike*, is certainly an *institution* of Jesus Christ, as well as to make the same *profession of Faith*, and *hope*. Indeed, that, being so *numerous*, they should have one *Officer* over them all, and joyn to *hear* one Ser-

Mr. Hudson Vind.

mon,

men, or receive the [illegible] Sacrament [illegible] rial, (as he speaks) is a right [illegible] favor, and not only false, but impudent. But
See Johns 4.22,23. I would gladly know a reason, why two, or more members of no particular Church, but only of the Catholick meeting together, and having a Minister among them, may not joyn together to worship God, in prayer, preaching, and partaking of the Sacrament, as well as the members of several particular Churches, and himself among them, may do the same, as they do often at London and Oxford, when he preaches, unlesse he will count those Ordinances then and there administred, no acts of instituted worship. And if he grant them to be worship, how can he deny that Assembly, to be a particular Church, though it be not fixed nor gathered and united, by any explicite Covenant, or consent to live and dye together. I shall only note again, that herein he deserts his friends in
Ubi supr. New England; who say, "particular "Churches, are parts of the universal as "Totum or Integrum. And none think otherwise, but they (to use his words) who have profit by the fable.

§ 2. p. 114. What then is the specificative form of a particular Church? "The formall reason "consti-

"consisting of a particular Church, &c.
"shall be joyned together in the same profes-
"sion of Faith, Government, Worship, &c.
from whence the Catholick Church is now
it is enlarged, hath not the same specifi-
cative form whether it be considered as a Genus, or as a Species, it cannot
have the same form with the species or
parts. But it have another specificative
form of its own, as may from that be
called an Universal Church, as well as a
particular from its form, may be called
a particular Church. Why then is the
Catholick called a Church Universal?
"Because all Christians throughout the world,
"(excepting some individuals providential-
"ly excluded) do agree in the enjoyment of the
"same preaching of the Word, the same Sa-
"craments administred in Specie, professe
"one common Faith, & Hope. The sum is
the specificative form of the Catholick visi-
ble Church (if it have any) is the profession
of the same Faith and Hope of the Go-
spel; whether the members enjoy the
same Word and Sacraments, adminis-
tred in Specie or no? And he needed
not to have excepted any individuals
providentially excluded from those Ordi-
nances: for himself tells us an instance
of a man, that never was partaker of
those

those Ordinances, and is yet a subject of Christs visible Kingdome a member of this Church in the world. p. 139. And before that supposes, a man may be instructed in the knowledge of the Gospel, &c. the Scriptures set before him, and make profession of it where he lives, though he be a thousand miles distant from any particular Church, wherein the Ordinances are administred, not perhaps knowing there is any such Church in the world. p. 137. If then a joyning together in the same numerical Ordinances, be the specificative form, of a particular Church, (of which more anone) why may not the profession of the same Faith, and hope of the Gospel, be the specificative form of the Catholick Church? The truth is, the Church considered in the threefold notion, with the threefold differences, is not distinguished into species, or hath any such specificative forms; but is one and the same Church, considered in that threefold Notion, as the members may be considered, as 1. Believers. 2. As Professors. 3. As Partakers of the same numericall Ordinances of worship, as is said above, and shall appear more hereafter.

The

The *Rules* of this Church comes next § 32.
to be considered; which, we shall easily
grant him, is not first the *same* with that
of the *Catholick invisible*, because many pag. 116.
are *members* of this, who are not *true* be-
lievers. 2. Nor the same with that of
a *particular* Church, because many are of
the Catholick, who never were of a *par-*
*ticular* Church. 3. Not yet, hath it its
union, by a relation to any one *Officer*,
given to the whole, or a subordination
of Officers, as *Papists* pretend: In all
these we consent with him; and there-
fore passe by the large discourse about
them, as not concerned in it. It consists
saies he, "*In the profession of one Lord, one*
"*Faith, one Baptism, Eph.* 4. 5. That all p. 133.
the *members* of the *Catholick Church* are
united in this profession, is very true;
but this is not all, they are bound to
more than this, *viz.* to the *exercise* of the
same *specifical* Ordinances, to *subjection*
to the same *Discipline*, as also to *Love* to
one another; and, where it is possible, to
the *celebrating* together, of the same *nu-*
*merical* worship. And in any of these,
to make any *differences*, is a *breach of that*
*union*, that ought to be among the *mem-*
*bers* of the *Catholick visible* Church.
Wherupon that is a strange assertion, or

addition

page 117.

§. 4. The [illegible] of this profession, for the

the preservation of this Union to be
not to abide, 1. That all necessary [p. 134.]
truths of the Gospel be believed and pro-
fessed. 2. That no other principle of the
Creed, inconsistent with that real belief of
those truths professed, be maintained by
the professors: Those that are enemies of
the Cross of Christ, have not any members
of this Church in them. That no private Error
or false doctrine contrary to any necessary
truth professed, be willed and deliberately
professed also. To which I have but
this to say, 1. The professors of Christ were
for a time ignorant of many necessary
truths of the Gospel, and some professors
there were, that had not heard whether
there was an Holy Ghost or no. Act. 19.
Yet these were members of the Catholick
Church. 2. Those whom the Apostle cal-
led contrary to the Cross of Christ, were
Christians, and so members at least of the
Catholick Church, if not of a particular.
As the incestuous person, was a member
of the Church of Corinth, till he was
ejected. And it is apparent of his own
party, that he was a scandalous member tolerated,
[illegible] a member in all Ordinances, for him-
self, and others: wherewith how this
Reverend Author agrees, may be seen,
when he says, in [illegible] profession of the [p. 136.]

knowledge

"knowledge of God commonly [illegible]
"of wickedness, is not to be [illegible]
"them, if they [illegible]
So that such a man is [illegible]
lived, without excommunication: and
if he be a wicked Minister, he is ipso facto
unministred or degraded, and all his
Ministerial acts are void. Adde to this
what he saies p. 159. "Let those (that are
"prophane) profess what they will, and cry
"out a thousand times that they are Chri-
"stians, I shall never acknowledge them to
"others, than visible enemies of the crosse of
"Christ. Traytors and Rebels are not de-
"ny'd subjects of that King, in reference to
"what they are so. They are out with
"the Church, no more than a Jew or Ma-
"hometan without the same precincts. There
are in a few lines, many mistakes. As
1. Though they be as bad as, or worse
than Mahometans in regard of their spi-
ritual estate, yet are they better in regard
of Church estate. Does the wickedness
of their lives, make them Heathens in
point of polity? then must they be rebap-
tized, upon their conversion, as Hea-
thens are. 2. If they be no better than
Heathens, then are their children to
be denyed Baptism, and are very Infi-
dels: yet a child of the prophanest Jew
was

was circumcised, and had right to other priviledges. 3. That it is far from truth, *That Papists and Rebels are not de facto the Subjects of that King, in reference to whom they are so*, that they cannot possibly be *Traytors* and *Rebels* to him, unless they be his Subjects. As he said, *A man cannot possibly be a Schismatick, unless he be a Church-member*, either of a particular, or of the Catholick Church. 4. Doth not the Apostle call fornicators, drunkards, unruly walkers, brethren? 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. 2 *Thes.* 3. 17. But these three *properties*, are moved on, to insinuate, that if there be no *breach of Union*, in any of these there is no *Schism* to be found in the *Catholick Church*, nor between the members thereof: as appears in his application of them.

For granting for *process* sake, "*That* §. 2.
"*Schism is the breach of any union in-* p. 140.
"*stituted by Christ*; *the enquiry is, whether the guilty of the breach of such an union*. And for the first of these, the *profession* of all necessary truths of the Gospel, the *Church of England* in her doctrine, is as *Orthodox* as any Church under Heaven, *consonant* to the Scriptures.

He and

and Apostolical Church; still by Tradition, some pretended Teachers have corrupted the Faith by damnable Heresies, and blasphemies, disowned by the Church. The Scripts thus charged upon us by Papists, in this respect, [illegible]

See p. 141

"doors, who have not only deviated from the common Faith of the Saints; but cause "others also to err, and attempt to destroy "all that will worship God aright; [illegible] We may say it also upon those Teachers, and Heretiks among us, who are their Disciples, who agree with them in many of their errors, and are departed from the common Orthodox Faith, of the Church of England, As upon the second; "That in our days, we do not manifest a "principle powerfully [illegible] with the "truth we profess." [illegible] have little reason to charge us with Schism, in this respect, whose doctrine generally is as abominable as their Deliverers. So I may ad-

See p. 148 §. 8.

ther wish Scotish Men profess, by acquisitions Churches from the charge, it cannot be denyed but the understandings of too many [illegible] Professors and Saints, as they would be called, are not such as become the true Seat of Religion, which we have so long enjoyed. Thanks for

the

the last, (3) That we add the same thereunto in keeping the worship, sacrednesse and ordinances of Christ, which are delivered unto us, and not to alter them insufficient to the saving worship of God. For our worship, (I humbly hope without offence I say) that is in the publick Congregations, (whatever it is in private Conventicles) according to the simplicity of the Gospel, though perhaps in some circumstances defective, wherein yet we are endeavouring Reformation. Thus far we are §. 7.
cleared, of a breach of Unity, and so of Schism. But I have insinuated, and partly proved, there may be a breach of Unity, both respect to the Catholick Church, upon other considerations. As first, where is a Bond that obliges every See pag. 205. 97.
member of this Church to join together in exercising the same specifical Ordinances of worship. Whereupon any man shall refuse to joyn with others, or refuse others to joyn with him, in these Ordinances, here is a breach of love and Union among the members of the Catholick Church, and in the particular Churches as parts of the Catholick. And what thinks he of those Churches, who deny Baptisme, to infants altogether? or those that deny Baptisme to the chil-

dren of *godly Parents*, not of their own *confederate* Churches, and the *Lords Supper* to the Parents of such Children?

§. 41. The *Anabaptists* do the one, contrary to the practise of the *Universal Church* in all Ages since the *Apostles*, and themselves do the other day, as is too well known. Is not this a *raising* of differences in the *Universal* Church, a *breach* of union, and so a *Schism*? Yet as he is *earnest* to free himself from *Schism* in his Narration; so he seems not to think *Anabaptism* to be a Schism. p. 826. "*He that will* "*upon that account, undertake to prove* "*them* Schismaticall, *may find himself* "*to be entangled.* Of which more hereafter.

§. 8. That this *Catholick Church* is *visible*, he grants, which others of his friends

p. 146. have denyed. That it is an *Organical politicall* body, in a right sense, is largely

Mr. *Hudſ.* and *learnedly* proved by others, (though he denies it) to them I refer it. One thing I cannot but take *notice* of, he sayes, "*It will not suffice to say that* "*Christ is its Head, for if as a visi-* "*ble politicall body, it hath a politicall* "*Head, that Head also must be visible.*

But

But 1. What necessity is there, the Head must be visible? seeing he confesses, the Common-wealth of the Jewes was a *Politicall Body*, and *God* (who is invisible) was their *Politicall Head*. 2. *Jesus Christ*, the *Head* of the Church, is a *visible Head*, yea sometimes more, *visus*, seen of men, while on earth, though now for a time, in *Majesty* (as some great Princes do) he hath *withdrawn* himself from the sight of men on earth, yet is he seen of Angels, and Saints in Heaven. But that, by the by. p. 148.

## CHAP. VI.

### *Independentisme is Donatisme.*

§. 1. WHat he sayes, for many *leaves* together, for vindication of Protestants from the charge of Schism, in their just separation from Rome as the Catholicke Church, I cannot but acknowledge to be rationall, solid, and judicious. Onely I am not satisfied with his assertion, "*That he not onely* "*denyes the Church of Rome (so called) to* "*be a particular Church*, p. 154. *but* "*also affirmes it to be no Church at all*, "*page* 156. Wherein he hath *deserted* most of our *Divines*: as we shall shew hereafter; our cause being *defensible* without this Plea. But I am farre more *unsatisfied*, that he undertakes the cause of the *Donatists*, and labours to exempt them from *Schism*, though he allows them *guiltie* of other *Crimes*, and Miscarriages. The grounds of this *undertaking*, I suppose to be, 1. His singular *notion* of *Schism*, limiting it onely to differences, in a *particular Assembly*; 2. His *jealousie* of the charge of *Schism*, to be objected to himselfe, and partie;

It

if *separating* from the true *Churches* of *Christ*, be truely called *Schisme*. For the ventilating whereof, I suppose, we may, without flattery or falshood, grant him his request (in respect to our selves, not to *Rome*) that is "*put the* "*whole Protestant Church of God, into* "*that condition of Liberty, and soundnesse* "*of doctrine, which it was in, when that* "*severe was made by the Donatists.* Certainely most of the *Protestant Churches* (our own among them) have as much *Liberty*, as sound in doctrine and as (if not more) *sincere* and incorrupt *Ministry*, than those Churches from which the *Donatists* separated; (they being not onely troubled with *Heresies*, as we all are, but pestered with multitude of *Ceremonies*, from which wee are free.) And now we shall take his thoughts of the *Donatists Schisme*, into consideration. The objection raised by him selfe, is this. "*Doth not* Austine "*and the rest of his contemporaries, charge* "*the Donatists with Schisme because they* "*departed from the Catholicke Church?* "*and doth not the charge rise up with e-* "*quall efficacie against you as them? At* "*least doth it not give you the nature of* "*Schisme in another sense, than is by you* "granted?

p. 163.

p. 162.

granted? This objection concernes not us, the generality of Protestants who grant that sense of Sebium — that "it is a breach of union, or a causelesse separation from the true Churches of Christ: but it lyes in full force against him and his party, who have broken the union of our Churches, and separated themselves from all the Protestant Churches in the world; not of their own constitution, and that as no true Churches of Christ, for lack (as they say) of a right constitution. We know indeed where and by whom this Cloud is scattered, without the least annoyance to the Protestant cause, as formerly stated; even as himselfe hath stated it, and produced the answers of our learned Divines, p. 190, §. 47. &c. which he highly approves, p. 19. though he rest not in it, but rather erreth in his own way, as we shall see erre long.

p. 194. That his defence is, to vindicate himselfe and his party, as well as the Dissentists, from charge of Sebism, is evident by what he layes, "I shall clearly deliver my thoughts concerning the Dissentists, which will be comprehensive also of those others, that suffer with them in

former

*reformers, and after ages, under the same imputation.* It will therefore be necessary, or very *expedient*, to consider, how neer their *case* comes to be *parallell*, with that of the *Donatists*, both for *matter*, and *manner*, of mannaging it; and then, how he will free them and himself from *Schism*. For the first; The *Donatists* having raised *causelesse differences* in the Church, about *Cecilianus* being ordained by the *Traditores*, (which, whether it were true or false was no just *ground* of *casting* him out of *Communion*, *q.* 7.) *made that the ground of their separation, however they took in other things* "(acts usual) into their defence afterwards "*q.* 16. The *principles* they first fell upon, were those two, long since named, "1. *That they were the onely Church of* "*Christ, in a corner of Africa.* 2. *That* "*none were truely baptised, or entered* "*members of the Church of Christ, but by* "*some of their partie.* That the Stage is changed from *Africa*, into *America*, is evident, but that these were the *principles* of the *Brownists*, and are now of all *Independents*, (for all Sects are *Independents*) I need not exemplifie, by drawing up the *parallel*; he that *runnes* may read it, in their books and practice. I wonder

not,

nor; that the Doctor hath unchurched Rome, for he hath done as much to England, and all forreine Protestant Churches, and makes none to be members of the Church, but such as are by covenant and consent joyned to some of their Congregations.

§ 3. Secondly, for the manner of management of their way, the parallel runns but on four feet and even. I. He sayes of the Donatists, "That upon "supposition they had just cause to renounce the Communion of Cecilianus, for "they had no ground of separating from p. 165. "the Church of Carthage, where were many Elders, not obnoxious to that charge." The parallel comes home to him thus. "Upon supposition we grant that the "Church of England, and himself, had "just cause to renounce the Pope, and "Church of Rome, yet had he and his no "ground to separate from the "Church of England, where there were "many Elders and people not obnoxious "to that charge of Idolatry upon the "Church of Rome. Leaving the inference given to your selfe, I shall "only add, that in sayes of the Donatists, I doe not see how sober Christians might be startled at the Communion with

"our

"our late Hierarchicall Church; yet not
"thing but the height of pride, madnesse,
"and corrupt worldly interest, could make
"men declare hostilitie against all the
"Protestant Churches of Christ, in the
"world; which owne to regulate all the
"Churches in the world by their own fan-
"cie and imagination. 3. This line is
also parallel. "Though men of such pride
"and folly, might judge all the residue of
"Christians, to be faultie and guiltie in not
"separating from our Churches, yet to
"proceed to cast them out, from the very
"name of Church members, and so disan-
"null their privileges, and ordinances,
"they had been partakers of, (as manie
"sober sons do, by baptizing all that
"enter into their communion, and others
"by denying both Sacraments to some,
"baptisme to Children of parents, and Lords
"Supper to parents themselves, not in their
"Church way) is such unparalell'd phre-
"nesie, and frenzie, as is wholly to be
"condemned, and intolerable. 4. Once
more, and I have done; the consequences
that befell the Donatists separation,
are too much parallel. "The divisions,
"outrages, and enormities all sorts of
"the Levellers and such like) and sects (as
"the Ranters and Quakers) that have be-
"fallen

Mr. Baxt. Mr. Firm. Sep. exami. Mr. Raie. Gem. pleb.

"fallen some of them, or they fell into, (beginning at Independentism) were and are in many pious and wisemens judgment, tokens of the hand of God against them, to witnesse that their undertaking and enterprize, was utterly rashe, and unlawfull. I wish they may patiently consider all this.

pag. 19.

§. 4. Thirdly we expected to heare, how he would free them, and himselfe (in neere agreeing with them), from the charge of *Schisme*, in their *separation* from the true *Churches* of Christ. Hee cannot but acknowledge them to be *faultie*, many wayes, but not guiltie of *Schisme*: If he would acknowledge as much of his own way; I should use his own words, "*Let the breach of unity* "(in the Churches) *be accounted* (if you "please) *Schisme, or a crime; for being an* "*evill, I shall not contend by what name or* "*title it be distinguished*" p. 81. But he waves the question whether that *separation* of the *Donatists*, from all other Churches, might be called a Schisme, and takes it for granted, they and himselfe, are free from that charge; for so he sayes. "*How little we are, at this* p. 167. "*day, in any contests that are managed a-*

"*mongst*

"mongst us, concerned in those differences "of theirs, those few considerations afore "will evince. Its true indeed, in our Separation from Rome, the instance of the Donatists, is very impertinent: as in other respects, so in this, that they separated from the truely Catholick Church, we from the Idolatrous, corrupt, particular Church of Rome, falsely called Catholicke. But it concernes him and his partie neerely, in respect of their separation from all true Protestant Churches, agreeing (as they doe) in the principles and practices of the Donatists. The question then is unresolved, whether their and his separation may justly be called Schism. All he layes is this? "We are thus come off from this part of our "charge of Schism, for the relinquishment "of the Catholike Church; which as we p. 168. "have not done, so to do, is not Schism, "but a sinne of another nature and imper- "tance. The ground he goes upon, why separation from a true Church, is no Schism, is that afore: That Schism, "in the Scripture notion, is onely a division "of judgment, in a particular Assembly, not a separation from any Church: which if it were true, (as it is proved false above) as it would free Protestants from

from that charge by *Papists*, with ease; so it will acquit himselfe, and all Sectaries in the world, from the crime of Schisme; That the principles and principall parts of all *Communists*, & chiefly they are to the Catholick Church, some of whose members they have been called, (as the Donatists were of old) was, and is Schismaticall; was and is the opinion of almost all Ancient and moderne Diuines. And if it be true, (which his partie silence do, that their *Churches* are onely highly *confirmed*; and other *Churches* and *Ministers* are false, or none; (as they do also *assert*) they are equally guiltie of that Schismaticall principle, That (*they are the only sound Catholick*) particular *Churches*, out of whose Communion they are (*ordinarily*) no Saluation. This very *principle*, in the Donatists first, and then in the *Romanists*, hath been the ground of all those sad *differences* among the Churches, along time; and of the *troubles* that have ensued thence (and to make *differences* in Churches and troubles thereupon to *separate*, is acknowledged, or proved to be Schisme; then the *assertors* of the like *differences*, and *persisting* to maintaine them, upon the very same *principle*, (as the only true

Churches

Church, how it can be corrupted from Schism, I am to learn.

That I was not mistaken, in the ground he goes upon, to free the Dissenters of old, and Presbyterians, together with himself, from the charge of Schism, was, his own notion and definition of Schism, will now appeare, in his own answer to the Romanists argument, which he rather insists upon, than upon the solution of our learned Divines. He takes Schism in the notion and sense of the Scripture professedly, that is, for divisions onely in a particular Church; And thereupon denyes, that there can be any separation from the Catholike visible Church; or, if there could, it would be madnesse to call it Schism. nor from the Catholike visible, because the forsaking its Communion, which consists in profession of the same Faith, is not Schism, but Apostasie; nor from a particular Church; for that is not properly Schism; for so he says, I deny that separation from a particular Church, as such, is properly separation, or Schism, or ought so to be esteemed, though perhaps such separations may proceed from Schism, and attended

§. 5.

pag. 193.

"tended with other evils: But this "mistakes the question; for the Romanists themselves do not mean, That every *separation* from any *Church* is *Schism*, as such; but a *causeless separation* from the true *Catholick Church*: which they suppose themselves to bee. And so some, and most of ours do take it, as he observes, *page* 191. *sect.* 48. and so they fall upon the *Idolatry*, *Heresie*, &c: of the *Church* of *Rome*, as just causes of separation from her "*which plea* (saies he) "*will not be shaken to eternity.*" Hee affirmes "*that separation however upon* p. 194. "*just cause, from any Church is no Schism.* This, (as it is the same with the former, in sense, so) is by none denyed. "*That this* "*is granted by all persons, Schism is causeless, say all men however concerned, separation upon a just cause is none*" and therefore cannot be *Schism*, which is always a sinne. Hence it appeares, that hee needlessely denyes their *Major* proposition, being rightly understood, in *their sense*, who propounded it. And our *Divines* did better to deny the *Minor*: We have neither *voluntarily*, nor *causelessely* separated from the Church of *Rome*. But his answer, is another thing: "*Separation in the sense controverted about*" p. 194. "*must*

a mutuall bottome [see] condition of pag. 195
[illegible] a Church of his opinion, otherwise it will not be standing [illegible] at least not in a Gospell sense. The Summe is this, *Schisme is a separation from a Church of Christs institution; but our separation from Rome, is not from a Church of Christs institution; therefore it is no Schisme*: And though it be true, that the nationall, *Hierarchicall* Church of Rome, the *papall* and *patriarchall* Church, be not a Church of *Christs institution*, yet the *hinge* of his argument lyes here, That *Schisme* in the Scripture notion, is onely found, in a *particular* Church: which must serve him for more uses than one, as we shall heare anon. And thence he inferres, that *separation* either of one *Church* from another, or of persons from a Church, upon any occasion, *true* or *false*, what ever it be, it is no *Schisme*; which is spoken to above, and will come againe.

But that there may be *Schisme*, be- §. 6.
tweene Churches as well as in a particular Church, I prove by a double argument, *ex confessis*, 1. *Schisme is a breach of union*: But "*there may be a breach of union in the Ca-*

"Catholick visible Church. 2. Where there "are differences raised in matter of Faith "professed, wherein the Union of the Ca"tholick Church consists, there may be a "breach of union, but there may be differ"ences in the Catholick, or among the "members of the Catholick Church, in "matters of Faith professed. Ergo: I suppose his answer will be; "That the forsaking "of its communion, which consists in the "profession of faith, is not Schism but A"postacie, p. 193. §. 32. But that is not alwayes so; for both there may be differences in the faith, and yet no Apostacie: or if there be Apostacie, it may be a Schism, also. Apostates commonly make differences amongst professors, before they totally depart. Here must be remembred, of what he said, pag. 161. §. 12. "The breach of this union "(in the Catholick Church) And therein "the relinquishment of the communi"nion of the Church, lieth in re"linquishment of, or some opposition to, "some or all of the saving necessary truths "of the Gospel. Now this is not Schism, "but Heresie or Apostacie: That must be thus: If it be the relinquishment of all truths of the Gospel, it is Apostacie. If of some onely, (and they fundamentally maintained with obstinacie) it is Heresie

rest: but if it be of *some truths* onely, (of lesser or greater *concernment*) about which *differences* are by some raised, among the members of this *Church Catholick*, it may, by his own principles, be called *Schism*. His *evasions*, will be one of these two; 1. That he did condescend to examine his *Adversaries*, that *Schism*, Is a *breach of union*, but that he denyes to be the Scripture *notion* of *Schism*; 2. That upon the same account, he denyes *differences* to be *Schism* any where, but in a *particular* Assembly, Wherein he is *singular* and alone; and is sufficiently disproved above.

But *stating* belike, that in his *so answering*, some of ours, would be readie to take up those words spoken to our Saviour, upon another occasion; "*Master, in so saying thou puttest us to rebuke us also*;" He starts an objection, from the consequence of it utterly *unchurching Rome*, thus "*Whether the devesting of the Synagogue of Rome, of the priviledges of a Church, in any sense, arise not to the downfall of that Ministry, at this day in England.* To which, before we take his answer, I would say, 1. That most of our *pious learned Divines*, have hitherto not denyed, but that *Rome* was a Church, in some sense; not a *true*, but

§. 7.

pag. 196.

a corrupt Church, as having some privi-
ledges, or rather some remainders of a
Church; as the same Articles of Faith,
baptisme, and a kind of Ministery, &c.
2. That hereupon they have defended
our Ministery to be true; though some-
times, coming through their hands, with many superadditions to the
institution of Christ. Others perhaps
would say, we had it not from Rome;
there were other Bishops in England be-
fore Austin came hither, from whom we
might receive our Ordination successive-
ly. But heare his kind answer. "If
"any man hath nothing to plead for his
"Ministery, but meerely that successive
"Ordination, which he hath received
"through the Church of Rome; I
"cannot see a stable bottome of owning
"him so to be. But (not yet to regett
to him, his successive Baptisme, which he
received through the Church of Rome)
this would go neere to annull the Minis-
stery, of those Martyr-Bishops, and Min-
isters, our first Reformers, who at first,
had nothing to plead, but their succes-
sive ordination, from Rome; and acted
upon it accordingly; He cannot gratifie
Rome better, than to asperse the Minis-
stery of England; it is the setting all busi-
ness, in all the present Sectaries. They look

See D. Hall Apol. against Brownists Sect. 23.

upon

upon himself, & his partie, (who have either *none*, or have *renounced* their *ordination*) as no *Ministers* at all: If we be *none* also, then have wee (as they *slander* us) had *Churches* all: God help the poore *deprived Ministers* of England. The *Romanists* say, we are no *Ministers*, because we have not our *Ordination* from *Rome*, the *Sectaries* say, we are no *Ministers*, because we have our *Ordination* from *Rome*, which shall wee believe? Neither, for we have it from *Jesus Christ*, by whose hands soeuer we had it. But, as a little *blushing* at this hard saying, he will *mollifie* it a little. "*I do not say, if he will* p. 196.
"*plead nothing else, but if he hath nothing*
"*better to plead.* "*He may have that which*
"*will constitute him a Minister, though he*
"*will not own, that he doth.* What ever else we plead, unlesse we will *renounce* our *Ordination*, it will not please them. (That by *Bishops*, is by them pleaded *null*, or *Antichristian*; and that by the *people*, which he intends), we think is *nothing*, and cannot own it, as a ground of our *Ministry*, though perhaps, we have their *call*, as well as himselfe. "We may have
"(as many of us have) your *call*, and *elected*
"to be *their Ministers*, from the people, but our *Ordination* we shall justifie

p. 197. to be from *Christ*, and not from the people. But hear more, "Nor is it said, "that any have their Ministry from Rome "as though the office which is an Ordi- "nance of Christ, was instituted by Anti- "christ: but the question is, whether this "be a sufficient foundation of our manifo- "interest, in the office of the Ministry, "that he hath received Ordination, in a "succession through the administration "of, not the woman flying into the Wilder- "nesse, not of the two witnesses, not from "them, whom we succeed in Doctrine, as "the Waldenses, but the Beast in selfe.

Does he not by this, call *Rome* in the face of our *Admirall*, as all our good friends, the *Sectaries*, doe? I have much adoe to forbeare saying; (The Lord rebuke thee). But I answer; 1. Why may it not be as sufficient a *foundation* of our *Ministry*, as for our *Baptisme*, which was never questioned hitherto, but by our late *Independent Anabaptists*, upon another ground? 2. Had we received our *Ordination* from the *woman* flying into the Wildernesse, or from the *two witnesses*, of the *Waldenses*, all had been one to him and his party. For they had not their *Ordination* from the *people*, (except some extraordinary cases) but from a *presbytery*, according to the *Institution*

*Either he must go forward to An-baptisme, (as many have done) or come back to us; as was said to the Brownists, by Dr. Hall Apol. Sect. 11.*

Institution of Christ. And yet, forsooth, "he will not plead this at large, "professedly disclaiming all thoughts of "rejecting those Ministers as Antichristian, who yet adhere to this Ordination, "being many of them eminently gifted of "God, and submitted to by his people, &c. Egregium vere laudem! While he secretly derives their pedigree from Rome and Antichrist, the Beast, &c: that yet adhere to that Ordination, if they have nothing else to plead. As for their eminent gifts, as they do not plead that as sufficient for their interest in the office, without Ordination, so many of his and our brethren have those gifts, whom we judge not therefore to be Ministers, though he do. And as for the submission of the people to us, we had that ever, if not explicitely, (as often) yet implicitely, (which some Independents allow as sufficient to make us true Ministers, and true Churches) though we do not own Ordination as from that submission of our people, but from Jesus Christ. Even from such also they seperate.

But some aske; "why was Ordination §. 8.
"from Rome, as well as the Scripture? p. 198.
which question I like not: but should

rather after; (why not ordination, as well as baptism)? All our fore Fathers doubtlesse received their *baptisme* by the hands of *Romanists*, and never scrupled it, to be *rebaptized*: why not *Ordination* also, without a new Ordination? They received not *baptisme* from them, as if *instituted* by *Antichrist*, but as an *Ordinance* of Christ; They baptized, not as *Antichristian*, not as *Bishops*, or *Romish Priests*, but as *Presbyters*, in whose hands (we say) *Ordination* also is. Onely since, we have taken away those humane *Additions*, which they had sinfully introduced into the *Ordinances* of Christ. The *Scriptures* are not the Inheritance of *Rome*, but Priviledges for all the people of God, where ever they find them: and therefore we deny we received them from *Rome*, any more than the *Jews* received the Golden *vessels* from *Babylon*, because they were sent by the hands of *Cyrus*. It is false then,

p. 199. *that Ordination is derived from the Authority of the Church of Rome as such.* Nor doth the granting *true Ordination* (as also true *baptisme*) to the Church of *Rome*, prove that it is a *true Church*. This he sayes, but he understands not; *They who ordained, had as power so to*

*do*

"do, but as they were officers of that "Church; as such they did it; and if "others had ordained who were not offi- "cers of that Church, all will confesse "that action to be null. Do but change the scene to baptisme, and heare what he will say. They who baptized had no power to so do, but as officers of that Church, as such, they did it: both which must be denyed, or he must deny his baptisme; They did it as Officers, not as Officers of that Church, that Papall Anti-christian Hierarchy; And if others had baptised (ordained) who were not Officers of that Church, or they, as Officers but not as Officers of that Church; (which is as a scab upon the hand) no rationall man hitherto hath affirmed that action to be null. This is "no such dark passage, that the "Doctour cannot see one step before him, unlesse his new light hath dazled his eyes, that he cannot see Wood for Trees, which before he fell into this way, he saw so many learned and pious men walk in, before him. For our parts, we pro- fesse, that in his way "of personall qua- "lifications, and acceptation of the people, to make a man, without Ordination, a Administer the passages in Scripture

See Apol. against Brown. Sect. 27.

See p. 199

But they who will not be content- ed, &c.

Church

Church stories are so clear, that we cannot see one step before us? But this hath sufficiently by others been discussed.

## CHAP. VII.

### Of the particular Church, and its Union.

WE are now come to the last acception of a Church, as it frequently signifies a particular Church; though all the places produced by the Doctor do not (I think) prove that sense. But I shall not contend about it. That the Church of Hierusalem, was called one Church, is true, but that those many thousands could meet in one Congregation, or in one place, is nothing probable; it is possible he may take this as an argument of a particular constituted Church.

p. 202.

See p. 199.

But they will not be content-

ed.

"1. In this definition there are
"some things to be considered.

"1. The definition of a particular
Church by him given, will be applica-
ble, and is by himselfe or others of his
side applyed to the three severall notions
of a Church, or the Church in those seve-
rall respects. 1. To the Catholick invisible
Church: "It is a societie of men called out of
"the World by the Word to the obedience of
"the faith in Christ, and joyne performance
"of the worship of God in the severall divi-
"all Ordinances, according as the order by
"Christ prescribed. This is all one, as
true of the invisible Church, they are call-
ed (which will be the onely exception)
to the joynt performance of the worship
of God, in the same (specifick) and
where as possible, individual Ordi-
nances. And all the members thereof
(ordinarily) being of some particular
Church, in both precepts and necessity
to joyne in that performance. The
same may be said of the Catholick visible
Church. "It is a Societie of men, called
"out of the World by the Word, &c. So
himself describes it, "that is in profession
"of all those who call on the Name of
"Christ in all places, in profession of their
"faith and obedience unto him. p. 112. and
before

D. Ames The Church (in generall) is a societie of men called out of the world. p. 64 §. 2.

before that happy [illegible] all Professors of
"the Gospell, throughout the world, called
"to the knowledge of Christ, by the Word,
[illegible]
"Kingdome [illegible]
[illegible]
to be [illegible] to worship
him [illegible]
indefinitely [illegible]
[illegible]
the members of this [illegible] Church,
its [illegible] for them also,
[illegible] And this
is [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[

What exception may be made, we shall heare anon in his words.

2. The Order prescribed by *Christ*, is §. 2.
not that all *Christians* must be of the same *individuall* particular congregation, but of this or that, as is most *convenient* for them, by their habitations. Supposing severall *meetings* or Congregations in *Jerusalem*, one of *Paul*, another of *Apollo*, &c: no man was obliged by any *order* from Christ, to be of *Paul's* Congregation, or of another's, so he joyned himselfe to one, for the *participation* of the same Ordinances. And when a *Christian* did joyne himselfe to this or that Congregation, he did not *explicitely* enter into a Covenant, to live and dye in this Congregation, but thought himselfe bound to be of one, by the *obligation* of his membership in the *Catholike Church*; with a *libertie* reserved, to remove to another, if he saw just reason; as our *Author* will confesse anone. Whence it is evident, that from the beginning of *Christianity*, there was no such *explicite covenanting*, or (as some speake) *marrying* of the *Minister* and people, or of people one to another, that they might not depart *without leave*: but

*Every beliefe is obliged to joyne himselfe to some one of those Churches, that therein he may abide in doctrine and fellowship, and breaking of bread, and prayer. p. 206.*

as they had *liberty* at first, so settle in such a *congregation*; so also to remove their *habitations* ly and to settle in another; not to goe many miles to partake of the Ordinances; which seemes not *suitable* to the first *plantation* of Churches; and the *mutuall duties* of people of one congregation: But of that elsewhere. And though the *Reverend Ministers* of *London* doe grant, (*pag.203.*) that in "the beginning of Christianity, the number "of believers were so few in great Cities, "as that they might all meet in one "place; yet they did not imagine, that when they at *Jerusalem*, were multiplyed into many *thousands*, or *myriads*, they could to do. And if they met in *several places*, (as they must) they had also severall *Elders*, to administer the Ordinances to them, and for their called *singularly*, one Church. Adde to this that at *Ephesus* (*Act.* 20. 17. a place brought to prove, there was but one *particular* Church there) the text saies expressely, there were (*many*) Elders there. (*Ye send from Miletus to Ephesus, for the Elders of the Church*, which evidences clearely, that there were more Congregations then one, in *Ephesus*, for how could many *Elders*, officiate in one Congregation?

tion. This alone, (if nothing else could be had) affords more for a *Presbyterian Church*, than all the *New Testament* does for an *Independent* Church, gathered (we know not how) out of many Churches. But he waves the dispute of this, p. 204. and to do it,

To the consideration of the *unity* of this Church, and the *breach* of it, hee premises some things: 1. *A member* p. 205.
"*of the Catholick invisible*
"*Church*. 2. *Of the Catholick visible*
"*Church, and yet by some providential*
"*hinderance, be never joyned to a particu-*
"*lar Church*, which I grant as true, but onely note two things to be satisfied in; 1. How he can *reconcile* this, with what he said before, p. 203. Sect. 26. "*The*
"*members of the Catholick visible Church,*
"*are initiated into that profession of faith,*
"*by baptism.* But *Baptism* (according to his principles) is an *Ordinance* of worship onely to be enjoyed in a *particular* Church; unlesse he will grant (what yet he does deny, but will be forced to grant) that a *Minister* is a *Minister* to more than his own Church, even to the *Catholick* Church; and may administer Baptism out of a particular Church, as

*Philip*

*Philip* did to the *Eunuch*, and *Paul* to the *Jayler*; or else deny *Baptisme* to be a part of *institated* worship; let him take his choice. 2. I note also, how he is at distance with some of his friends, in *New England*, who assert, "That no "man can be a member of the Catholike "Church, but he must first be a member of "a particular. But 3. he grants; "Every beleiver is obliged to ingage himself "to some one of those Churches, that there "he may abide, in doctrine, and fellowship, "and breaking of bread and prayer; &c; "if he have opportunity. This he willingly grants, and I as willingly accept, for an use I shall make of it anone, but I like not so well his reasons. 1. "There "are some duties which cannot possibly be "performed, but upon supposition of this "duties previously required, Matth. 18. 15, "&c: If he had said, those duties cannot so well be performed, its true; but some of them are due to others, beside our own Congregation; But I shall make this advantage of it; That if they cannot *possibly* otherwise be performed, then some of their *Church-members*, are ill gathered, living many *miles* asunder. *Congregation* in Townes and Parishes, seemes a necessary *requisite*, to Church-

*Mr. Hooker's survey* See, my Review page 219.

p. 206

members

membership. 2. "*There are some Ordi-*
"*nances of Christ, which they can never*
"*be made partakers of, not related to some*
"*such Society; as Admonition, partici-*
"*pating of the Lords Supper, &c.* As for *Admonition*, it is a duty that concerns every man, to any man, though not of his *particular* Church, though *specially* to them of their own society; And as for partaking of the *Lords Supper*, why may not one enjoy it in *another* Church, as well as *Baptism*; which he allowed before to one of the *Catholick Church*? If *Christians*, professing the same *Faith*, were looked on as *Brethren*, and as having thereby *right* to the Ordinances of Christ, in any *Church* where they come, they might be *partakers* of Ordinances though not particularly *joyned* to a particular Church. But this ingrossing the *common Ordinances*, to a few *confederate* persons, and making the rest little better than *Heathens*, as to their *Communion*, violates the *Order* of the Gospel, and the Rule of *charity*, and may justly be called Schism.

His third reason, I like yet worse, § 4.
"*That Christ hath given no direction for*
"*any duty of worship, meerely and purely of*
"*soveraign institution, but only to them,*

"and by them, who are so joyned. But then I would ask, 1. Whether *Philip* Baptizing the *Eunuch*, in the way, had *Christs* direction for it, or no? or, is *Baptism* no part of worship? 2. *Prayer*, and *reading* of the Word in private families, are they no duties of worship? 3. *Preaching* to convert Heathens, (and then to *baptize* them) is it not a *duty of worship* belonging to a *Minister? Rom.* 10. 14. 4. Let me be so bold, as to ask once more; By what *Authority* doth he himself *preach* and *pray* to, and with the *Parliament*, or at St. *Maries* in *Oxford*, with a mixt unjoyned congregation, &c? Or are not these there and at that time, parts of worship of Christs Institution? I hope he will not say so. 4. For his fourth reason he gives this, "*The Apostles in planting of Churches, took care to leave none whom they converted, out of that Order, where it was possible, &c.* But this is evidently false in the case of the *Eunuch*, the Deputy, *Acts* 13. *&c.* Unless where there were *none* converted to make a Church. But he laying so much *stress* upon a *particular* Church, and the necessity of joyning with it, it seems *reasonable*, there should be some *directions* to enjoyn every single *convert* (*impossibilities* only excepted)

ted) leaving all *inconveniences* at least, to joyn himself to some *particular* Church, rather than not to *partake of the Ordinances all the dayes*, as he said afore. For the 5. *Christs institution of Officers for them*, &c. that is, for particular Churches onely, if it speak reason, is as weak as the rest; For its evident, 1. That Christ instituted *Officers* at first, for the *whole Church*, as the Apostles, &c. *Eph.* 4. 11. 2. All those *Officers* ordinary, as *Pastors* or *Teachers*, are set in the *Catholick Church*, and every *Minister* is first a *Minister* to the *Catholick Church*; if he deny this, he knows where to find a *learned Antagonist*. The last reason (as all the rest) is *fallacious*, or inconsequent, Christ took care for particular Churches, therefore the *Ordinances*, are no where to be had by any man, but in his own *particular* Congregation.

That there is an *instituted worship* of God, to be *continued* under the New Testament, to which *humane prudence* may add nothing, is a certain truth, denyed by none, but *fanatical* spirits. And as for the *institution* of *particular* Churches, by express words of *Scripture*, it is no where visible, but by a fair and necessary *consequence*; That which is of *Insti-* §. 6. p. 207.

*tution* was, that Gods people should *serve* and *worship* him *severally* and *joyntly*, in such and such Ordinances of *worship*; and consequently by a *necessity* of nature, there must be a *place* for people to meet together in, or *more*, as their number is; God institutes *publick prayer*, *preaching*, *Sacraments*, therefore there must be *societies*, to perform this *worship*. 1. Because of the multitude of *Christians*, which can neither *meet* all in one place, nor *exercise* those *acts* of worship in too great a company. 2. For the better *obligation* of all professors, as to the *exercise* of all acts of *publick worship*, (which some, if left *free* to joyn with all, or any, would utterly neglect); so of all those *private duties*, required of *fellow members*, which cannot well be performed (as was said) by *persons* not conbined. But the *circumstances* of those societies, *how many*, *how great*, what *persons* shall associate, is left to *humane prudence*, with an eye to the general *Rules* of Scripture, that all be done *decently*, in *order*, and to *edification*. And that those that are so joyned, are so *confined*, that they cannot, or may not worship God in the same *Ordinances*, occasionally in other *Churches*, let him that can, shew the *Institution*; for I know

none

none; yet this is the chief piece of *Independency*; never yet undertaken to be proved by any of that party. Our *Author* grants, that a man is at *Liberty* to settle in what Congregation he pleases, and remove at pleasure; And the *light* of common prudence, (upon supposition that there must be such *societies*) seems to to dictate, that when all of a *Nation* are Christians, there should be a distinction o *Churches*, or as we call them *Parishes*, made by the *bounds* of mens habitations; so that the *divisions* be discreetly made, that the Congregations be neither *too big*, nor too little, and that the parties of each Society, may dwell so near together, that they may be fitter to perform the *services* of God in publick, *decently* and *in order*, to *edification*; and also those *mutual* private *duties*, of brotherly *inspection*, *admonition*, &c. required by Christ, *Matth.* 18. 15. 1. *Thessal.* 5. 14. &c.

And this, he in a manner confesses, § 7.
"That there is in the *Institutions* of p. 209.
"Christ, *much that answers a natural*
"*principle in men, who are fitted for socie-*
"*ty; A confederation and consultation, to*
"*carry on any design of common concern-*
"*ment*, &c. I suppose he may intend

this, of *Synods*, carryed on by *Delegates* from several Churches; which is suitable to that *prudence* we see in *States*, assembling in *Parliament &c.* But I shall improve this further. As the *light* of nature taught men to *unite* themselves, in *Towns* and *Cities*, for their better *security*, and mutual *assistance*, and *comfort*: So the same prudence taught the *Ancients*, to distinguish *Cities* into *Parishes*, for their better *Assembling* (some else would be of *no Church*, as pretending to be of all, or any, as we see at this day) for *carrying* on the services of God, in a better, and more profitable *Order*; and for those private *duties* afore spoken of. Nor does any man rationally hence conclude, "*That there is no more but this*, in "*this* Church constitution, *that men* "*may be cast into any prudential form, &c.* For the *way* of worship, is peculiarly *instituted*; but the way of *constituting* particular Churches, for *persons*, for *number*, &c. needs no *institution*, but is left to the *prudence* of men, or Churches, as afore.

§. 8. p. 211. "*Whether by any promise of Christ, there* "*shall be always somewhere a visible Church* "*visibly celebrating his Ordinances*, he told us above, was a *needless enquiry*, p. 85.

yet

yet both there, and here enclines to the *Negative*, that all such *Church state* may cease, for some time, and hereafter talks of "*an intercision of all Ordinances, so far* "*as to make a nullitie in them, as to what* "*was of simple and pure institution*, p. 271, In this place, he glosses some Scriptures, (alledged of others, as meant of the *Catholick visible* Church) to be understood of the *spiritual Reign* of Christ, in true believers. *Luke* 1. 33. *Math.* 16. 18. Of the sense of which place, I shall not now *contest* with him: For the thing it self, something shall be said, in answering those *questions* which here he propounds. 1. "*If is said, true Churches,* "*were at first planted in England, how then* "*did they cease to be? How, or by what* "*Act did God unchurch them? They did* "*it themselves meritoriously, by Apostacy* "*and Idolatry, God legally by his Institu-* "*tion of a Law of rejection of such Churches.* But first if *Idolatry* and grievous *Apostacy* will merit an actual *unchurching*, not only the *Israelites*, but they of *Judah* had deserved it long before they were *unchurched*. And if *Apostacy* in a great measure will *unchurch* a people, *England* hath of late years *Apostatiz'd* sufficiently from our *Ancient* truths. 2. Where

hath God instituted such a *Law*, to reject a *Church*, presently, so soon as it proves *Idolatrous* or *Apostatical*? *Rome* had not then been standing at this day. 3. It is a question, whether God ever *absolutely*, unchurches a people, till he utterly destroys them: as he did the *Israelites* of old, and the whole *Jewish Church*, after *Christs* death: and the seven famous Churches of *Asia* since. 4. As also, it would be resolved, when God did *unchurch* England, (which he *insinuates* as granted) Whether whilst it was *Popish* & *Antichristian*, or since the *Reformation*? 5. Let him resolve us, whether our first *Reformers* did *intend*, or undertake to *raise* up a new *Church*, or to *repair* the old corrupted state thereof (as they that returned from the *Babylonish* Captivity, did not build a *new Temple*, but *repair* and purge the old. 6. Whether at the *Reformation* in *K. Edw.* & *Q. Eliz.* days, there were not *true Churches* planted in *England*? & then how they came to cease to be, seeing they were rather *perfected* since, than corrupted? 7. Lastly, Whether our *Reverend Author*, do not in his *conscience* think, "*There were no true Churches in* "*England till the Brownists, their Fathers,* "*the Anabaptists, their elder Brothers, and*

themselves

"themselves arose and gathered new Churches, not out of true Churches, but out of "Babylon, as their Predecessors used to "speak: which he yet seems to insinuate when he saies, "The Catholick mystical, "and that visibly professing being preserved "entire, he that thinketh there needs a mi- "racle for those who are members of them, "to joyn in such a Society, as those spoken "of, according to the Institution of Christ, "is a person delighting in needless scruples. p. 212.

As if he should say, There was *no* Church of *Christs Institution* in *England*, till they or their *Predecessors* arose, and gathered such *Societies*; and when all *Church State* was here lost, they had the happyness and honour to revive it. *Mette virtute.*

2. Those last words of his, were the answer to his 2d. question; "*How then is it* "*possible, that any such Church should be* "*raised anew?*" To which he gives that answer, "*I say the Catholick Church mystical &c.* And to make it good, he proceeds further to say, "*Christ hath* "*promised, That where two or three are* "*gathered together in his name, he will be* "*in the midst of them.* But I pray to whom was this *promise made?* was it not to his *Officers*, the *Apostles*; in their *consultati-* §9.

ons,

*ons*, or *Church-determinations*? Or grant it made to *Believers*, is it not as true of them that are *out* of his *Church-fellowship*? When two or three *Christians* accidentally meet together, and *pray*, &c. Is not Christ also in the midst of them? Yea, grant him his own sense, what then? "*It is now supposed, with some hope to have* "*it granted, that the Scripture being the* "*power of God to salvation, hath a sufficient efficacy in it self, for the conversion of* "*Souls.* All this is granted; what God may do by his *extraordinary power*, we determine not; but this is *ordinarily* done by *preaching*, and those *Preachers* in *Office*, Rom. 10. 14. But go on: "*It is* "*not impossible that though all Church* "*state should cease in any place, and yet the* "*Scripture by the providence of God, be* "*there in the hand of individuals, two or* "*three should be called, converted and regenerated by it.* This also may be *supposed*, though I believe he cannot *exemplifie* such a case; The *question* only would be, if some *Heathens* should find the *Scriptures*, how they should understand either the *Original Languages*, without a *Teacher*, or a *miracle*; or the sense of them, without a *guide*, as the *Eunuch* said to *Philip*? But suppose all; they

are

are *converted* by the *Scriptures* alone? What then? He asks "*whether these* "*converted persons, may not possibly come* "*together in the name of Jesus.* No doubt they may, if they were 20. or 40. of them; But can their *assembling* together, make them a Church? How can that be, before they are *baptized*? and how *baptized* without a *Minister*? Shall they be *Se-baptists*, or *baptize* one another? I suppose our *Author* is not yet come to this. But he says; "*May they* "*not upon his command, and in expectation* "*of his promise, so come together, with reso-* "*lution to do his will, and exhort one ano-* "*ther thereto?* Truly (to use his own words) I believe they may, in what part of the world soever their *Lot* is fallen; Where then lyes the *difficulty*? "*In this,* "*whether being come together in the name* "*of Christ, they may do what he hath com-* "*manded them or no? whether they may* "*exhort and stir up one another, to do the* "*will of Christ?* No, there is no *difficulty*, but *duty*, in all this. But here lies the *difficulty*, which his *new notion*, or his *haste* made him forget, "*How these persons* "*can come to be a Church, before they are* "*baptized, and how they can be baptized* "*without a Minister?* Were not men pre-

p. 213.

*See Confess. of 7. Anabap. Churches Art. 34. A Church is a company of baptized persons.*

prejudiced, or prepossessed, with some *Anabaptistical* fancy, here would be the difficulty of the business. The *Iberians*, if stories say true, were converted by a *Christian woman*, and by a *miracle*; but surely, she could not *baptize* them; therefore they sent for some *Ministers* to baptize, and to put them into *Church Order*.

*So were the Indians converted by lay-men, as called.* Socrat. *Hist. l.1. c. 15.16.*

§. 10. It was the *Soul-sick fancy* of our late *Seekers* (that had lost all *Religion*) that all *true Church state*, was lost in all the *world*, as well as in *England*, (and our *Author* thinks little less) till the *form* of his own Churches was found; and therefore they expected some extraordinary *Officers* to rise up from the dead; which was to look for a *miracle*. And in the case propounded, of two or three *converted* by the *Scripture* alone, in a remote corner of the world, I would gladly know, how a *Church* can be *begun* without a *miracle*? For though a company of *baptized* persons, might (in an extraordinary case) choose themselves, *Officers*, *primo vice*, and so make a Church; yet *unbaptized* persons converted, cannot make a Church, till they be baptized, and who shall baptize them without a *miracle*, unless *providence*

dance send them a *Minister* to do it? For true *Believers* or *Professors* of the faith, as such, cannot make a *particular* Church: their own *first principle* of a *particular* Church, must be *baptized persons*, and how they can come to be such, without a *Minister*, without a *miracle*, I cannot yet see. This is the bottome of the *Seekers*, now turn'd into *Quakers*, "*All* Church state *is lost, and no recovery* "*of it without new Revelation*; and so they fancy the *Spirit* to be given to them, to begin a *new Church*. And in our brethrens *new Church-way*, had their *people* renounced their *baptism*, (as *Anabaptists* have done) as they themselves have renounced their *Ministry*, I would be informed, whether they could ever have made a Church of *unbaptized* persons, without a *Minister*, without a *miracle*; and then, whether they must not turn, either *Anabaptists* or *Quakers*, either making *Baptism* administrable by any brother, that hath the holiness to take it up; or expect *new Revelations* of the indwelling Spirit, and so become *extraordinary Officers*. This and more that might be said, imports (for ought I see) that there shall never cease to be a *Church* or *Churches*, wherein some

See Confess. of 7. Churches Art. 41. The person dispencing Baptism, is a discipse, not tyed to a Church Officer.

some *instituted Ordinances* shall be preserved (though covered over with much *corruption*) those particularly, of the *Ministry* and *Baptism*; or else the *Church-state* being once lost, and perished, can never be *restored* without a *miracle*. When *Judah* was carryed away captive to *Babylon*, with all her *Priests* and *Levites*, and all the *materialls* of their *National* Church-state, the *Temple* destroyed, &c. It may seem, that their whole *Church-state* was ceased as to their *Ceremonial worship*, for 70 years together; It might be asked, "*How then it was possible* "*to revive that lost Church-state without* "*a miracle*? The answer may be, That God *preserved* the seed of that Church at *Babylon*; partly in preserving the people there, a remnant of his circumcised people; partly in reserving the *holy vessels*, useful for their worship, and partly in *keeping* the *Line* and *Genealogy* of the *priesthood* entire; so that when all these were brought back to *Jerusalem*, they had no need of a *miracle*, to revive their *Church-state*; or, to build a *new Temple*; but only to *purge* and repair the old, and to set up the *instituted* services, in their power and purity. The application is so easy, that the *Reader* will outrun me:

So

So, when *Antichrist* had usurped tyrannically (like another *Nebuchadnezzar*) over all *Churches*, ruind *particular* Churches, corrupted the *Ordinances* of Christ, *Word, worship, discipline*, yet God reserved *secretly*, some true *believers*, and some *professors*, together with *so much* of his *Ordinances*, as to *substantialls*, and necessary *ingredients* to a Church, a *Ministry*, and *baptism*, &c. that when he stirred up the heart of *Luther*, and other *Ministers* (like another *Zerubbabel*) and some people to *separate* themselves from the *Romish tyrannie* and corruptions in *doctrine* and *worship*, they needed no *miracle* to beginne a *new Church*: but some being *ministers* of the Gospell, so made in their *Ordination*, and all being *baptized*, they did not *raise a new Church*, but onely purged the old.

We are come now to consider, with him, "*What is the Union and Communion of a particular Church, that so we may know wherein the bands thereof do consist.*" And instead of telling us what this *union* is, he tells us what is the *foundation* of that union; which he makes to be double; "*The one externall, procuring* "

§. 11. pag. 214.

"*cating commanding*, viz. *the Institu-*
"*tion of Jesus Christ*, *before mentioned*,
"*requiring peace, order, union, consent and*
"*agreement*, *among all the members of it*,
"*&c*: But I think that all this is the *foundation* of the union, both of the *invisible*, and *visible*, Catholick Church; All the members of *them*, (as well as of the *particular*) are under those *commands* of *Christ*, requiring peace, order, *&c*: for their *walking* in such *societies*, when and where they can associate: and where is then the difference of this *Church*, from the other? 2. "*The inter-*
"*nall foundation of this union*, *is that*
"*Love without dissimulation*, *which all-*
"*wayes is*, *or ought to be*, *betweene all the*
"*members of such a Church*, *exerting it*
"*selfe*, *in their respective duties*, &c. But this also, is the foundation of the *union* of the other two *Churches*; *Love without dissimulation*; as was said a-
p. 98. bove. And so yet we have no *difference*. But we enquire, what is the *union* it selfe, or rather what is the *forme* (for that gives *union*) the *specificating* forme, that distinguishes this *Church*, from the rest, the other two aforegone. This it
p. 215. is: "*The joynt consent of all the members*
"*of it*, *from a principle of Love*, *to walke*
"*together*,

"together, in the universall celebration of "all the Ordinances of the worship of God, "and to performe all offices of Love, to "one another, &c: But most of this, is applicable to the other two Churches, or notions of a Church: All the *members* of them, are bound by a *command* of Christ, to *consent* or *agree* to *joyne together*, (when and where they can) from a *principle* of Love, in the *universall celebration* of all the Ordinances of worship, and the rest: what then is the *Specificative forme* (if it have any) of a *particular* Church? And if it have a forme, to distinguish it *specifically* from the other, have not they also *formes* to distance them from this? And if so, are there not *three species* of a Church? which he seem'd to *deny* above. We have them all, described below, p. 236.

"The forme of the Church Catholick, ab-"solutely so called, is the unitie with "Christ, and in it selfe, by the one Spirit, "whereby it is animated. This is not very accurately spoken: Is the *unitie* of the *head* and *members* the forme of a man? It is not rather, the *one Soul* that animates it, "the oneness of soul, where-"by the whole is animated. p. 95. And

will be safer than the own Spirit of God in the form, or soul, that animates the Catholick Church? I was afraid, when I read above; "That which, as a form, informs (the soul in man) the mystical body of "Christ, is the Animation of the whole "by his Spirit." I was afraid to soften this conceit upon the words: Not did, I think, he intended any such things when he said, "That life-giving is no more, but even alive, I cannot easily consent," p. 49. But upon second thoughts, finding him to repeat the phrase of Animation by the Spirit in this place, and to talke of the Inhabitation of the Spirit, p. 94. 95. & the Indwelling Spirit, I began to suspect him to exclude at least, to this error, (for so it hath been reputed by all Orthodox Divines;) And since I heare, that he preached this publickly at Oxford, "That "believers have not only the Spirituall Presence, and operation of the Spirit in them, "but the person of the holy Ghost indwelling in them;" which was the error of one of the chiefe Leaders of Independent sort, in New England, and by his brethren there condemned; which is seriously to be by them considered. God seemes to blast their way, not onely by

p. 95.

See the Appendix below, Sect. 4.

suffering

suffering their people to fall from them, but also by letting themselves fall into [illegible], or strong delusions. Not onely some that were once theirs, have fallen into some dotages of Popery and Arminianisme (almost all the sects preach those points) but some of themselves, that fell not so farre, have yet ventured damnable and damned doctrines; as I could instance, but forbeare. But to returne; 1. The forme of the Apostolicall Church, is, (say some of his side) Faith. 2. The forme of the Catholick is visibly professing, the unity of that; as being by them professed; that is, say others, (and he above) the profession of the same Faith. 3. The forme of the particular Church; as such, is its reference and performance of the same Orders of worship unanimously in the profession of the same Faith, and subjection to the same rules of Life, for the edification of the whole. To which the first, the difference of the said above, the unity of our Church, (which he makes the great thing to be sought, and very properly) is the [illegible] of all the members to perform the same Ordinances of worship; but not the [illegible] of all Ordinances, &c. And indeed p. 236.

deed this seemes to be the *specificating* difference or forme of this Church, as distinct from the other; *the Communion of all the members of it in all the same numericall Ordinances of worship.* And this is the plaine truth; dropped from him unawares, (contrary to his partners and his own Judgment) concerning the forme of a particular Church. It is not, (as they have hitherto) *an explicite consent* of all the members, but *the observance and performance of the same Ordinances of worship numerically, as the confession of the same Faith, &c.* Whence I would inferre,

1. That if the members of the invisible or visible Church Catholike do occasionally meet together in observation of the same numericall Ordinances of worship, then and there is found a particular Church; though no explicite consent be passed by them, one to another.

2. That the explicite consent, they so much talke of, is not necessary by institution of Christ to the forme or essence of a particular Church, (the implicite covenant of Christianitie binding them to such performance, when and wherein it is possible) but is

been

onely a prudentiall meanes or bond, for the better tying of members together, for obseruance of the Ordinances, and to exercise mutuall duties of love, to one another, as hath been said. But as I said above, there are not three *Churches* differing *specifically*; but a *notionall* distinction betwixt the *whole Church*, or the members of it, as they may be considered, 1. As true *believers*, 2. As *professors* of the same Faith; 3. As *partakers* of the same worship. Now its evident that one and the same person may be all these; to wit, a *visible professor*, and *visible worshipper*. As we use to say in *Philosophy*, there is a threefold life, *vegetative*, *sensitive* and *rationall*, which may be all three, in one man, & yet but one man or creature. So then the *forme* of a particular Church, (if it have any) is rather *communion in the same meanes of worship*, than *joynt consent* to communicate in that worship. That *consent* Dr. *Ames* makes not the *forme* of a particular Church, but the *bond*, to tye the members fast together, then to their *publick* and *private* duties among themselves. For as a man may be a *believer*, or a *professor*, and yet not

have opportunity to [illegible] the same worship (as he speaks) with all and every member of a Church, every Christian is bound to desire, consent to that faith, and to joyne in the performance of the same worship, when and where onely he hath opportunity: Which he granteth above, p. 205.

§. 12. But I desire to know, what he meanes by that joyne consent of all the members of a particular Church? I suppose he intends it, (as his practice proves) of an explicite covenant, entered by every particle, that joynes to that society, gathered, or to be gathered. This is their daily practise. But then I desire an instance, of any Church in Scripture, or story, so consenting to co-covenanting as before. And withall I would aske, whether none be members of his Congregation, but onely such, as give this explicite consent? If he say, Not any, but such; I aske, whether the Children of such Church-members, both and bred up in that Church, be not to be accounted members? If he say, they are implicite in their parents. I reply, this is but an implicite consent; but he required an explicite

explicite

Nicolaitans. And then I would tell him, that the teachers of New-England grant, that an implicite consent or covenant is sufficient, to make out Churches true Churches, and yet our brethren here separate from us, as no Churches. 2. I would gladly be informed, where the Scripture speaks of any other consent, or Covenant, to Church-membership, than that of Christianitie, wherein they engaged, at baptism, to serve God according to his word, and to walke up to all duties of all relations, one towards another. 3. I would yet be satisfied whether this explicite consent, be exclusive that none may partake of those Ordinances, (common to all Christians) in their societies, but such as enter this consent? Their practise here and in New England is, or hath been, that none can have Communion with them in Church Ordinances, but onely such, as are confederate. 4. They will not baptize the child of the most godly parent, nor admit to the Supper, the best learned and pious person, not-married into their Church. If they have relinquish'd this practise, it's well; but if they have, they destroy their own principles, and prove themselves the more in-

furious to our Churches, in *separating* from them. 3. And as for those *offices of Love*, spoken of, I take once more, are they *also exclusive*, to be tendered to none, but their own *combined* members? It should seeme so, because they are here limited to the *members of this particular Church, in their respective places and stations.* And their practise hath been answerable. As they account none to be *without*, but such, so some have said: "*It lay not in us to do with* "*a Christian, not of their own way, that* "*with an Heathen.* How truely is *Schism* attended with *breach of Charitie!*

§. 13. p. 216. But yet behold his liberalitie. "*I* "*shall further grant, that over and above* "*the union, that is between the members* "*of severall particular Churches, by vir-* "*tue of their interest in the Church Catho-* "*lick, which draws after it a necessitie* "*of the occasionall exercise of love one to-* "*wards another, and that Communion* "*they have as members of the Catholick* "*visible Church, &c. There is* [redacted] "*munion also to be observed, between those* "*Churches as such, which is or may be ex-* "*erted in their Assemblyes, by their De-* "*legates, &c.* What doth he meane?

That

That the members of each particular Church, as congregated, have communion; but not with the members of another particular Church? That is, that their practise somewhere. On the same members of several particular Churches, that are assembled at several times in the worship of God, in the same Church? This was not their practise once, though they were [illegible] the same christian-like, [illegible] one member of one Church might not receive the Supper in another, that the Minister and minister [illegible] the Supper in another Church; preach, they might as gifted brethren, which they observed them to do not Heathen. Whose [illegible] of [illegible] were of several Churches. And for their Officers, [illegible] he speaks of, only occasionally occasionally; which they gave and tender to an Heathen; which not only their interest in the Catholick Church, but even the Law of Humanity draws after it as occasional exercise of duties of Love, as the Samaritan once expressed. In a word this Communion of members of several Churches, is nothing but what is due to and from the members of the Catholick visible Church, that never were joyned

§. 14.

p. 217.

p. 218.

at least of divine institution; but of mere prudence, as was newly said. But nothing, as I proved, there ought to be a communion between all pertinacious Churches, but only in profession of the same Faith, and also in the same specificall, and where it is possible, numericall worship, the refusing to hold this unity and communion, in doctrine or worship, is the matter, and well deserves the name of Schism. 3. "If that de-
"sired peace of any man or men be done with
"what strife, variance, judging, and con-
"demning of others, it cannot be evill, in
"form, circumstances, &c. This is
as much as to say, that departure which is not evill, is not evill; For Schisme in its nature signifies or presupposes variance, strife, and divisions before the parting, and is commonly attended with judging and condemning of others, both persons and Churches, as experience tells us at this day. The very separation from a Church, to set up another Church, is a reall judging and condemning of the Church from whence they separated. Is it not the practise of all Separatists, to judge and condemne all our Churches as Antichristian, or none; to aspers us

as

as no *Ministers*, but *Priests*, &c? Is it not the *design* of his book, to prove (if he could) and *condemne* us as *no Churches*? Let the world be judge, that unlesse this be proved, he can never *justifie* his *separation*: either therefore, he must *prove* us to be no *Churches* of *Christs institution*, and that *before such a communion*, nor hath broken any *union*, of Christs appointment, (which he shall never be able to prove) or else he had need put himselfe, not upon the *Justice*, but on the *largest mercy* of his *Judges*.

# CHAP.

# CHAP. VIII.

§. 1. In his [illegible] of himself and [illegible] from the charge of [illegible], by [illegible] seem, he first lays down these [illegible]; to which both he hath [illegible] and engageth himself: let them, if they please, consider. I shall only take notice of the way, by some things [illegible] to the state of the dispute between us and him, and that very briefly. He first considers in what sense the *Church of England* may be taken: As 1. "*The people of God, his elect, &c.; in* "*this Nation, may* (though improperly) "*be called the Church of England.*" But why not as *properly*, as all *true believers* in the world, may be, and are by him, called the *Catholick Church*. The *world* and a *Nation* differ but as greater and lesser, as a part and the whole; and a *particular* Church is but a *part* of the Catholick, and so as properly called a Church. "*In this sense* (says he) *it is* "*our desire, &c. to be and abide* "*members of the Church of England; to* "*keep with it the unity of the Spirit, in the*

the bond of peace. But unless he think there are no members of this Church in England but those that are of his several particular Churches, I fear he will be found to break the Unity that ought to be between them. And indeed, it seems by their gathering the Saints of the first magnitude, they intend to have none the less of their Churches, which he (as much as they can) to make the Invisible Church, to be visible on earth. He speaks something satisfactorily this way, p. 90. "The Elect and the Church, are the same "persons, under several considerations; and "therefore even a particular Church, on the "account of its participation of the nature "of the Catholick, is called elect, 1 Pet. "5. 13. And yet he speaks "of some parts "of the Elect, namely, p. 127. which, Who they be in his Church, I know not. They leave those to us, to search and search out, and then they may admit them into their several Congregations. But he says, "If we have a friend, offer- p. 223. "ed, received the least member of his "Church, so that he may justly take offence "at any of our words, we profess our readi- "ness to lie at his feet for reconciliation &c. This strengthens the suspicion of what I said; For unless he take us all for impro-

bates,

matter we have and do profess our selves (and we think justly) regarded at their worst, and how ready they have been to give us satisfaction, let the world judge. The next that follows is spoken with equal confidence and truth. "If we have "not all the members of that Church, we "have not such terms, &c. for nor I forbear, He deludes us, when he says, if we do not these things, "we are censured the "worst Schismaticks that ever disturbed the "peace of the earth. For if we prove all or some of these to be false, yet he accounts none of them to be Schismatical, what ever they may be else.

§. 2. p. 224. "In this sense also, we profess our "selves members of the Church of Eng-"land, as professing and adhering to the "doctrine of Faith, the unity of which "hath been established, declared by Laws, "Confessions, Professions, &c. Will he undertake this for all the Independent Churches in England? Are not many of them grossly Apostatized from the professed doctrine of this Church, and so Heretical? But, were it true which he says for himself, they may be exempted from being Heretical; but they may yet be Schismatical in dividing communion

matter

matter of *worship*. For the *worship* of God, was as well *declared*, *professed*, *protested*, as the Doctrine. They hold *communion* with us in *profession* of the same Faith, but not in the *observance* of the same *worship*; yet are the *Ordinances* of worship as *pure* with us, as with them, or let them prove our *failings*, and we promise a *Reformation*. In this sense they are neither *children*, nor *members* of the *Church* of *England*. And this is the wonder, That professing, "*they re-*
"*ceived their regeneration and new birth*; p. 225.
"*by the preaching of the word and the sa-*
"*ving truths thereof*; *with the seal of it in*
"*their Baptism*, they should now *separate* from us, not only in that *Ordinance* of the *Lords Supper*, but also in the *preaching* of the *Word* and *Baptism*. Could they make use of our *preaching* and *Baptism*, for their *regeneration*, and not of the other *Sacrament*, and the same *preaching* for their *confirmation*? and besides, now renounce us as *no true Churches*? This we think is *Brownistical* and highly *Schismatical*. The *Anabaptists* deal more *rationally*, to their own principles, in denying our *Ministry*, and *Baptism*, and all *Church-state*, than they do. The old Rule was a, *The sincere preaching of*

"the Word, and right administration of the "Sacraments, are the Characters of a "true Church, Which we having, and they separating from us, in all Church-Communion; how shall this *crime* be named, but by *Schism* in the highest degree?

§. 3. p. 226. But as they have left us, so some of their *Independent Churches*, have left them, *viz.*, "*Those who have renounced the baptism* "*they received in their infancy, and repent* "*is amongst themselves.* And have they not done this, upon their own *principle*? "*That all true Church-state is lost in* "England. And if so, then no *true Ministry*, no *Baptism*, no *Church*, and then it must be revived, by a *new baptism*, the *door* of a true Church; It was told the *Brownists* long ago; "*either they must come back to* "*us, or go forward to Anabaptism*; and so must the *Independents*, if their *principles* and *conclusions*, be *consonant* to one another, yea many are fallen from them to *Anabaptism*; and I believe nothing but the *odium*, or some *private interest* keeps many more from following after them. But what thinks he of *Anabaptists*? are they *Schismatical*, or no, for their *separation*? Hear his *Apology* for them, "*yet I suppose, that he, who upon*

"that single account, will undertake to prove "them Schismatical, may find himself en-"tangled. To raise up differences, causeless differences (unlesse *Paedobaptisme* be a trivial thing) and upon that to *separate* not only from the *judgement* and *practise* of all the *Christian Churches* in the world, at present, but from the *judgement* and *practise* also of all the *primitive* and *succeeding* Churches in all ages, and all places, if this be not *Schismatical*, I know nothing that deserves that name. Sure the *Donatists* were generally accounted *Schismaticks*, for *rebaptizing* those that came to them, from other *Churches*: but, sayes he, "*The case is not* "*exactly with the Anabaptists, as it was* "*with the Donatists.* *Exactly* the same? True, for they lived in *Africk*, these in *Europe*. But they do the same thing; *rebaptize* the same that were *baptized* by us. That is granted; "*but not on the* "*same principle*: yes, upon the very same principle; though they added another, which the *Donatists* knew not. As how? p. 226. "*The Donatists rebaptized those who came* "*to their societies, because they believed,* "*that all administration of Ordinances, nor* "*in their Assemblies, was null, and to be* "*looked on, as no such thing.* And do not

*Anabaptists* think so, and say so of all the *Ordinances* administred in our *Church*? yea of *Baptism*, given to *Infants*, in the *Independent* Churches? Do they not, or would they not *rebaptize* any that comes from them, to their *Societies*? because they think their *Baptism* null, if not their other *Ordinances*. But he hath an help for this, "*Our A-*"*nabaptists* (yes your *Anabaptists*) *do the* "*same thing, but on this plea that though* "*Baptism be yet Infant Baptism is not an* "*Institution of Christ, and so is null from* "*the nature of the thing it self, not the way* "*of administration of it.* Yes, both ways they hold it *null*; and so much worse and more *Schismatical* than the *Donatists*. They *rebaptized* only (as some think) those that were *baptized* by *Cecilianus*, or some of his *Ordination*; but did not so with others, nor did they think *Baptism* in *infancy* to be *null* in the nature of the thing. But *Anabaptists*, rebaptize all, come they from what Church they will; and are not these the worser *Donatists*? But let him take heed, lest in *defending* a bad cause, he make himself guilty of the sin. Does not he himself *labour*, in this book, to prove, that the *Administration* of *Ordinances*, in

our

our Assemblies are *null*? Our *Ordination null*, p. 197. and *Antichristian*, from the *Beast*; And charging them that insist upon it, as "*keeping up what God* "*would have pull'd down*, p. 198. and consequently, the *Ordinances* by us *administred*, are *null*: And why then, is not he *rebaptized*? Yea our *Churches* are esteemed not of *Christs institution*, because not *lawfully* gathered; and are not these worse than *Donatists*? But he saies, "*This* "*falls not within the verge of my defence.* Yet he could not but speak a *good word* for them; They must not be *schismaticks*, lest he be proved so too. They are but one step before him, it may be his own case ere long. And I durst almost be his *prophet* to foretell what he and others will do; If they stick close to, and manage that principle well, "*That all true Church-state was* "*lost in England*: they must not stay where they are but go *forward* either to *Anabaptism*, and be *rebaptized*, or to *Quakerism*, (as some already are) and deny all use of *outward baptism*.

See page 206. §. 10.

But hear his conclusion; "*In these se-* §. 4.
"*veral considerations, we were and do con-* p. 226.
"*tinue members in the Church of God* "*in England; and as to our failing*

"herein, who is it that convinces us of sin? How warily, first; *Members in the Church of England*, not of it, not of any *particular* Church of *England*; but as of a *Church* new *revived* and gathered in *England*. But I ask: were they not *members* of some *particular* Church of *England*, when they were *baptized*? yea, for all *Ordinances* till of late, and some of them *Ministers* besides? And have they not renounced *Ministry*, and *Lords Supper*, and all but *Baptism*? Let them speak plainly: Were they *baptized* as *members* of any Church, or no? if of any, of what? if of none, how at all? unless they hold *Baptism* no Church Ordinance. And by whom? by a *Minister* as such to them? or is not *Baptism* a *ministerial* act? If they may receive *Baptism*, without *Church-communion* (if we be no *Churches*) why not also the *Lords Supper*? If *Communion* with the *Church Catholick*, may serve for one *Ordinance* why not for another? Or if they may receive *Baptism* validly, in our *Churches*, why not other *Ordinances*? These questions would be *seriously* and *conscientiously* answered. But how confidently he shuts up, "As to our failing "herein, who is it that convinces us of sin?

He

He that spake those words first, was more than a man. Its too much for any meer man to think, much more to say, *Who is it that convinces me of sin?* in his best performances: if men cannot, God can. But if our *Churches* were not true, sure they failed in *joyning* so long with us. Yet we charge them not with *failings* in their *Communion*, but for *relinquishing* that Communion, and at *parting*, to call *dirt* in their *Mothers* face that *bare* them them (as is confessed) as no *honest Woman*.

§. 5. The rest that follows for many pages together, concerning the *union* of a *National Church*, and *breach* of that union, I leave to them that are concerned in it. Only I shall take notice of one passage which is this; "*Whereas sundry Ordi-*
"*nances of the worship of God, are rightly* p. 245.
"*to be administred only in a Church, and*
"*Ministers do evidently relate thereunto;*
"*the denyal of a National Church-state,*
"*seems to deny that we had either Mini-*
"*sters or Ordinances here in England.*
How will he answer this? especially having renounced his own *Ministry*, received in this *National* Church, and all besides in respect of Church *Communion*, except his *Baptism*, as *null*, or *naught*.

Thus he saies, and thats all; "*It may* "*seem so to do, but it doth not, unlesse you* "*will say that unlesse ye be a National* "*Church-state, there is no other; which is* "*too absurd for any one to imagine.* The *consequence* cannot well be denyed, in his *notion* of this Church. For if there were no *Ministers*, but ordained by those *National Officers*, and those *Officers* not of *Christs institution*, (as he hath often pleaded) it follows necessarily, that first there were no *Ministers* lawful in this Church, and so no *Ordinances* truly administred in it, and at last no *Church* at all. This I doubt, or rather believe, by what he hath said, is his *judgement*, but he durst not speak out. For I ask, Does he in his *conscience* believe, there were any true *Ministers* in this Church, in the time of its being *National*? and if no *Ministers*, no *Ordinances* rightly administred. But why does he not tell us, what that *other Church-state is*, of which he speaks? he denies all, but the *Independent state* of new gathered Churches; which were not found in the *Prelates* times, except some *Brownistical* Societies: we shall not thank him for this *jejune* and *empty* vindication; but shall plead for our selves. Our former Di-

vines

times of the first *reformation*, and since, have pleaded, and justifyed their *Ordination*, for the *essentialls* of it, received from *Rome*; which being *purged* from all those *super-induced corruptions*, they propagated unto us, who may therefore the better *justifie* our own. Those *Bishops* that ordained us, had (as he told us above) a double *capacitie*; One as *Lord Bishops*, received from the *state*, *p.* 227. Another as *Ministers* of the Gospell, to *preach*, *administer* Sacraments, to joyne in *Ordination* of *Ministers*, *p.* 231. Now in this latter, some of themselves *professed*, (and so we *understood* it) that they ordained *Presbyters*, as *presbyters*, not as *Bishops*. Hence it followes, that though they presumed to themselves, a *Lordly power*, not according unto the *Institution* of Christ, whereby they called themselves a *nationall Church*, &c. Yet the *Ordination* being according to the *Rule* of the Gospell (as we beleive it is sufficiently proved, and never yet sufficiently answered) there were *Ministers* lawfully called, and *Ordinances* by them rightly administred; and that is the *other Church state*, which he would not doe us the *honour* to name, least he should thereby condemn himself as a *Schismatick*,

matick, in departing from this Church-state. These true and faithfull Ministers, (with their people in their severall Congregations) administring the true Ordinances of Jesus Christ (whereof their baptisme was one) were, and still are the true Church-state of England, for which we plead, and he hath forsaken. Some additions of humane prudence, cannot annull the Ordinances of Christ.

§. 6. The way of the prelates, he told us, p. 235. to stablish a nationall Church, was descendendo; of the Presbyterians, ascendendo; That is, "that such a thing "should rise from the particular Congre-"gations, by sundry Associations, and sub-"ordinations of Assemblyes, in and by "the representatives of those Chur-"ches. But this may prove a mistake. For, 1. The Presbyterians rather goe descendendo, as well as the prelates did at least in part: They agree both in this, that they acknowledge their rise and originall to be from the Apostles, who were the first founders of all Churches, and the supreme Officers of the Church; For them were other Ministers ordained, in subordination to them, Bishops say some, (Archbishops and then Bishops, lay

(say others) and they ordained *Presbyters* (subordinate unto them, or as he styles them) *parochiall Priests*, p. 235. The *Presbyterians* say, the *Apostles* first made *Presbyters*, and gave them power to rule their *particular* Churches, and as occasion required, to *meet* together, by *Delegates*, in a *Classis*, or *Synod* (as that at *Jerusalem* consisted partly of *Elders*, with the *Apostles*). 2. They say the first of *Ministerial power* to be *universall* as well as the *Prelates*, supposing a *Minister* to be a *Minister*, in what part soever of the world, his *lot* happen to be; and do not, upon his *removall*, give him a new *Ordination*; though he may not (for *order* sake) exercise that *power*, but when and where he hath a *call*. 3. That *call* may be different, 1. as he is called to take *care* of a *particular* Congregation, 2. as a *Delegate* to a *Classis*, or *Synod*, (which himself allowes, in the *Independent* way, as above) 3. As he is, in the *absence* of a particular Minister, desired to *Preach*, or *Baptise*, or do any other *Ministeriall* duty, to another people; (as when the *Parliament* commands Doctor *O.* to *Preach* a Sermon to, and *pray* with them) Now this *Delegation* (which he meanes by

by *Ascendendo*) doth not give him a *new power*, distinct from what he had before by his *Ordination*, but a *particular designation* to act this power, *pro hic & nunc*. As he hath often heard, but will take no notice of it.

6. 7. p. 247. Whether a *Church* may be called *national*; when all the particular *Congregations* of one nation, agreeing in *doctrine* and *worship*, are governed by their *greater and lesser Assemblyes* (as some learned *Divines* have asserted) I will not dispute; but leave what they have said, to the further consideration of their *Adversaries*: Though this may be said, they did not make this the only, or the *principall way*, of that denomination: That was rather, "*when all* "*the Congregations of a nation, agree in* "*the Doctrine and worship, and celebrate* "*it accordingly.* The *Disciplinary* part, or *forme*, of Government, is not *essential* to the Church, nor absolutely necessary; and the Church may *exist*, and be nationall without it: much lesse do any of ours say; "*That subjection to one ci-* "*vill Government, and agreement in the* "*same doctrine and worship specifically,* &c. *doth constitute one Church*: or as he expresses

expresses it, afterwards, p. 252. they do not say, "that being under one civil "government, does constitute a National "Church; for if so (sayes he) its forme "and unitie as such, must be given it by "the civill Government. For the unitie thereof consists still in the agreement in the same doctrine and worship, and not in the model of civill Government (of what kind soever). And if he allow (as he does) an Association of the Delegates, from severall Churches, to meet for matters of common concernment; by the same reason, (whether it be by Institution, or prudence) he must allow those subordinate Assemblyes. For the light of nature teaches the necessitie of Appeales, in male-administrations, for ending of troubles, and decision of differences, in particular Congregations; as was instanced in the Antiochians appeale, to the Church of Jerusalem, in such a case: which (I say) whether it were by an institution of Christ, or an act of Christian prudence, will serve our turne, to justifie such Associations, though we do not account them to be the forme, or cause of the union, of a Presbyterian Church; but rather, prudentiall

p. 250.

§. 8. Nationall Church, to preserve that mistake (of the *forme* of a Nationall Church to be the *institution* of greater or lesser *Assemblyes*) he proceeds, to premise some things, which may take off the charge of *Schisme*, for their *separating* from our Churches, as true as their own. 1. "No man can *possibly be a member of a nationall Church in this sense, but by being first a member of some particular Church in the nation; which concurres to make up the nationall Church.* But that not being our opinion, the consequence failes: He granted as much, as he pleads, p. 250. "*On the same account, (that all the professors of the truth throughout the world are the Catholick visible Church of Christ) may all the professors of the truth in England, be called the Church of England.* And in was his own profession above (to the contrary) "*That a man may be a member of the Catholick visible Church, and yet no member of a particular Church.* And why then may not a man be a *member* of a *Nationall* Church, and yet be no member of a *particular* Church? I could exemplifie cases, but I forbear. Indeed as the *state* of the nation, is, at this day, all generally being

pag. 251.

ing *baptised* (except *Anabaptists* Children) no man is a *member* of the *nationall* Church, but he is also a member of some *particular* Church: That Church being (as he oft hath said) the *seat of Ordinances*. Hence, 2. its evident that a *man may secede* from this *nationall* Church, and not depart from some *particular* Church; because he may be a member of the *nationall*, (as well as of the Catholick) Church, and yet be no member of a *particular* Church, &c. on the other side, a man may be a *member* of some particular Church, and yet be no *member* of the *nationall* (in the sense of it by him given) as himselfe and others do too much evidence. 3. He sayes, "*To make men members of any particular Churches, their own consent is required.*" If he meane this of an *explicite* consent (as I suppose he does, or he sayes nothing) it is fully disproved above: and *implicite* confessed sufficient. A man that removes his *habitation*, (as both he, and we grant its free for him to do) may, by *sitting down* in another Congregation, and *submitting* himselfe to all the *Ordinances* of Christ there, with *performance* of all Officers of *Love*, to the *members* of that Congregation, implicitely, and yet sufficiently, *consent*

to

to be a member thereof. And on the other hand, a man may not *remove* his habitation, from a *Congregation*, wherein he hath long *consented* to communicate, and yet remove his *consent* to be a *member* of another; as we see too much in this *loose* and wandring age.

§. 9. p. 252. But fourthly, he now speaks out, "That as yet, at least since possibly we "could be concerned in it, who are now a- "live, no such Church in this nation "hath been formed. It is impossible a "man should be guiltie of offending, against "that which is not; unlesse they will say, "we have separated from what should be. This *Engine* hath served him twice before; First against the charge of *Schisme* by the *Romanists*, *Their's is no Church*, at all, how could they *separate* from that which is not? Then against the *Prelat's*, *Hierarchicall* Church: *Their's* is no *Church* of *Christs institution*, "*That* which "is wanting cannot be numbered, p. 242. And now the third time, against the same *charge* by the *Presbyterians*. It is true indeed, there hath no such *nationall* Church been *uniformely*, formed in this nation; but he knows, such a *Church* hath been endevoured to be, formed

formed, *conformable* to the Word of God, and to the best reformed Churches abroad, according to our *solemne covenant*; and who have *withstood resisted*, and *hindered* it, (and yet do hinder) he knowes well enough. But withall, it cannot be denyed, but there are some *Presbyterian* Churches settled in *England*; (and perhaps some of their *members*, if not of *themselves* have been of them) from these they have *separated*, as well as from the rest. If there were not such here, there are such abroad, and yet they have *renounced communion* with them, as no true Churches, and that's a *negative separation*. Besides, there was, and is, another *Church state* in *England* in our *particular* Churches; from these also they have most of them (as once of them) *publikly separated*. The *Presbyterian Church state*, as to particular Congregations; in *doctrine*, *worship*, and *discipline* in them, is the very same with theirs, (excepting that they hold their *Congregations*, to be *Independent*, and entire for all *Government* in themselves; but wee acknowledg our selves *dependent*, and would be glad, we had other *Churches* to joyne with) and yet they *separate* from; and disavow

them as well as others. Lastly, I believe those men, that *raise differences* in a *reforming* Church, and *persist* in keeping open those divisions, *separating* also into other *new Churches*, do as well deserve the name of *Schismaticks*, as those that make *differences* in one *particular* Church. And unlesse they can better prove (than yet they have done) that we are no *true Churches*, and their own to be the onely *true Churches*, in the *nation*, in the *World*, the *Schism* will lye at their doot, (in all *equall* mens judgment); remove it, as they can.

§. 10. p. 253. *Let him read the next disputation of Amyraldus, his definition of a Schismatick: and his censure of those that separate, will little please him. Disput. de eccles. membris*

As for *Amyraldus* his judgement, of the *confœderation* of Churches, it is the same with ours, or not to the purpose. Our opinion is, that as the *consent* of *particular* members, explicite or implicite, is not the *forme* of a *particular* Church; So the *consent* of severall Churches, to *associate* in a *classis* or *Synod*, is not the *forme* of a *nationall* Church; The *explicite* consent of *members* (as they make use of it) is but a *prudentiall way*, to tye their members from *running* away from them, (and yet that will not do the deed) so the *explicite*

*Here* consent of *severall* Churches, into *Assemblyes*, is likewise a *prudentiall* way, for the better *Governing* of those Churches, and the easier *determining* of things of *common* concernment. And as the one, so the other, is a result of the *light of nature*, & need no *institution*. He may now perceive, that he is mistaken, in his thoughts of a *mutuall acknowledgment* of the things by him delivered; hardly in one of them do we agree. But we expected that he would (now at last) "*have laid down some* principles "*peculiar to himselfe and those with whom* "*he consents, in the way of the worship of* "*God*, &c. for not till then, will the *businesse* be brought to a *speedie issue*. As also we hoped, that he would have "*pleaded the right, libertie, and dutie of gathering Churches, in such a state of professors as that of late, and still amongst us, built upon other* (*and better*) *principles than any* (*though he had occasion enough*) *by him as yet mentioned*. But we must waie his leasure. His businesse and *policie* is (like the *Romanists* he spake of at the beginning) rather to *prove* us, and all Churches to be *corrupt* and not *rightly instituted*, than to defend

p. 254.

and *justifie* his own way of *gathering* Churches.

§. 11. But we are brought againe to his *removall* of the charge of *Schism*, which he layes, "*in the true notion of it, relates* "*not to gathering of Churches, as simply* "*considered*. It not as *simply* considered, yet as it is the *consequent* of those *divisions* and separations, included in the *nature* of *Schism*; Those that *make differences* first, and then *separate* from a Church, use not to *stay* there, but being especially *Ringleaders* of the *separation*, they must *conformably* gather *another Church*, of a *firmer constitution*, or else condemne their own *separation*, as being of *no Church*: And the rather does this relate to *Schism* in *gathering* of Churches, because they do not onely *depart* themselves, (which is more *tolerable*) but draw off others also into a *formed* faction. Lets heare the old *Dilemma* revived against the *Presbyterians*, as afore against the *Prelaticall* Church; "*Either we have been mem-* "*bers by our own voluntary consent, ac-* "*cording to the mind of Christ, of some* "*particular Congregations, in such a na-* "*tionall Church, as part of such a Church;*

"*or*

*or we have not*. It were *ridiculous* for any man to charg them with *separating* from such a Church, as never was *existent*, & that by their own *oppoſition* of its being, we blame them for *hindering* it to be ſet up *and for raiſing differences* in our Churches, and then *renouncing* communion with them, and all other of the like conſtitution, as was ſaid above. Sure we are; moſt of them, if not all, were once members of our *particular* Churches, and ſome of them prime *Miniſters* thereof; who after they had raiſed *differences* in thoſe Churches (which himſelfe ſayes conſtitutes a *Schiſmatick*) ſeparated themſelves, and *drew diſciples* after them, into new, *never heard* of *oppoſite* Congregations, ſetting up *Altar* againſt *Altar*, as the *Ancients* u'ed to ſpeak. But heare another evaſion; "*If we have been members, by our own* "*voluntary conſent*. As much by their *own voluntary conſent*, as they were made members of the *Nation*; that is, *implicitely*, as *borne* and *bred* up in both. May they not as well *renounce* their *intereſt* in the nation, as their *communion* with the Church? and deny *ſubjection* to both? Or, is it in their *power* whe-

ther they will be bound to *communion* with some *Church* or other, in the Nation unlesse they can prove them all *heretical* & Antichristian. Yet further; by way of *Recrimination*: Have not we done as much as they "*in separating from the*
pag. 255. "*Church of England, of Episcopall con-*
"*stitution? rejected their nationall Offi-*
"*cers? and the way of worship establish-*
"*ed, &c?* Not to *regest* to him, "*that*
"*this was done by other hands,* I must tell him, this is an *excursion*, when he is speaking of his relinquishment of a *Presbyterian* Church, to turne us back to the *Episcopall*: But this hath been his *businesse* from his first letting out, to make the *Presbyterian* Churches, to walke *pari passu*, with the *Episcopall* and *Romish* Churches. The *Churches* of England and all *Reformed* Churches are much beholden to him. Let him say plainly, have they not *renounced* all our *Churches*, since both the other were laid aside? what can he plead for this; but that we are not *reformed according to the mind of Christ?* as we shall heare by and by.

§. 12. p. 256. But he sayes, "*We expect not that we*
"*shall be accused of Schisme, for not esteem-*
*ing*

"ing our ſelves made *members* of a parti-
"cular *Church*, *againſt our wills*, *by buy-*
"*ing*, *or hireing an habitation within ſuch*
"*a precinct of ground*. Surely they were once *eſteemed* (and did eſteeme themſelves) to be *members* of thoſe particular Churches (whether with or *without* their wills I know not) where they were borne or dwelt, and muſt either be of ſuch or none. And is it not ſo, for the moſt part in *New England*? are not their *Townes* and *Churches* commenſurate? was not the Church of *Jeruſalem*, and *Corinth*, ſo called from the places? True it is (which was ſaid by the *Aſſembly-Divines*) "*that living*
"*in Pariſhes*, *is not ſufficient to make a*
"*man a member of a particular Church*, *a*
"*Turke or Pagan may do ſo*: but all *Church-members* in a *Pariſh*, are *members* of that Church, till they *remove* their habitations. Suppoſe there were but *one* ſuch *pariſh*, muſt not all Chriſtians, be of that, unleſſe they may be of none? But they adde; "*All that dwell*
"*in a Pariſh*, *and conſtantly heare the*
"*word*, *are not yet to be admitted to the*
"*Sacrament*, *which* (ſayes he) *excludes*
"*them from being* fideles, *or Church-*
"*members*, *and makes them at beſt*, *but*

"as the Catechumeni, *who were never* "*accounted* members *of the Church.* I pray, were not *baptized infants*, and *youth's*, members of the Church? yet were not they (nor are in *their Churches*) admitted to the *Lords Supper*; If those *Divines* meant it, of *unbaptised* persons (as they may) no mervaile if they were not *accounted* Church members. Yet what shall we say of *Infants* of Churchmembers, not *yet baptized*, are not they *Churchmembers*? none but an *Anabaptist* will deny it. And though the old *Catechumeni*, new come from *Gentilisme*, were not accounted *Churchmembers*, yet our *Catechumen's*, Children o *Christian parents*, are to be accounted such. But we proceed.

§. 13. p. 257. He hath further to say; "*If we have* "*been so members by our own consent, and* "*do not continue so to bee; then this con-* "*gregation, where we were so members,* "*was reformed according to the mind of* "*Christ or it was not?* We are now allmost at an issue; the intimation is, "*the ground of their separation is, that* "*none of our Churches are reformed, ac-* "*cording to the mind of Christ.* None of them? not at home, nor abroad? that's

that's a ſad condition. But what if they be in reforming ſhould they ſeparate from ſuch? Well, but ſuppoſe any be members of a Church reformed according to the mind of Chriſt? what then? "*If it were reformed, and a man* "*were a member of it by his own volun-*"*tary conſent, I confeſſe it may be diffi-*"*cult, how a man can leave ſuch a Con-*"*gregation, without their conſent; in* "*whoſe power it is to give it to him, with-*"*out giving offence to the Church of God.* That they have been *members* (and *Miſters* ſome of them) of our *Congregations*, by their own free *conſent*, is evident enough: That they have not *continued* ſo to be, is too manifeſt. That our Congregations ſome at leaſt were *reformed*, or *reforming* according to the mind of Chriſt, (when they ſeparated from us) cannot without great *injury* be denyed. What *difficulty* then is there to judge them *offenders* againſt that, and the *whole Church* of *England* in leaving thoſe Congregations, *without*, yea, againſt their conſent, if they had *ſuch power* over them, as he grants. But no marvel, they find no *difficulty* or *ſcruple*, in leaving our Congregations, without *any leave*; when they can and do leave

own

own Congregations, (*without* or *against* their leave, to which, (they say) they have been *married*, and may no more justly *divorce* them, than a man may his wife, (except for *fornication*) and only for a greater *portion*, or *preferment*. But I must *professe*, I know no *such power*, that any Church hath, to *engage* into, and enforce such an *explicite* consent, or to deny *leave* to any member, upon just causes, to depart, without their leave. He said before, "*All men must admit it free for* "*a man, to choose where he will fix his ha-* "*bitation.* Which if just reasons call him to, either he must *leave* that Congregation, (as too *distant* from his habitation) or else tye himself to much *inconvenience*, to enjoy the Ordinances of God there, which he may with ease, and as much *profit*, enjoy at his own door. If this be not an *enslaving* of Christians to the *prudential* (if not *politick*) *institutions* of men, and manifest prejudice to the *liberty*, wherein Christ hath made them free, I know not what is. But the best is, their people do not believe any such *difficulty* to remove from their Churches, but take the *leave*, without *humbly desiring* it (which he requires) without their consent, and run readily,

to

to the *Anabaptists*, and *Quakers* Societies.

Yea the Dr. is as ready to *indulge* this §. 14.
*liberty*, as they to take it; (it may be he may get the more *disciples* by it). For as he gives any man the *liberty*, to desert the *communion* of any *society*, if it be not *reformed* according to the mind of Christ, p. 265; So he allowes him this *liberty*, upon his *own light*. Hear him speak, "As the not giving a mans self up p. 259.
"to any way, and submitting to any establishment pretended, or pleaded to be of "Christ, which he hath not light for, is "no Schism, &c: So no more can a mans "peaceable relinquishment of the ordinary "communion in one Church, in all its relations, to joyn with another be so esteemed. Where first he seems to me to be a very *Sceptick* in his way of *Independency*; or to *gratifie* all the *Sects*, *Quakers* and all, with a *Toleration*. For why should they be denyed the *liberty*, of their own *light*, more than others? to *judge* what is, or is not, according to the mind of Christ, and to follow it accordingly, *submit* to, and *defert*, what way they *suppose* to be but pretended as the way of *Christ*. And why should they be denyed to make use of their *liberty*? without such

*According to that light, which men have received.* p. 46. §. 26.

*cum-*

*humble asking leave* of the Congregation. But I would make bold to ask one question: "*Whether does he indeed believe* "*his own way, to be the only true way of* "*Christ, (for he hath instituted but one* "*way) having run from, and renounced* "*all other waies of Religion in this Nation.* If so, is not every man bound to come into it? and not upon any conceited *new light*, to relinquish it? If not, then why doth he *encourage* men to leave the *Presbyterian way*, which, for ought he knows, may be the way of Christ? But whats this to the purpose? We do not say it is a *Schism* for a single person, upon good reasons, to remove from one Congregation to another; (as because he can not *edifie* so well by one *Minister* as another (provided it be not an *itching ear*, that causes it, as oft it is,) or in some *necessary worldly respects*) if he do it *peaceably*, without *contempt* of the Congregation, and *Minister*, from whom he departs: and not setting up a *new Church* against them: In this case, we leave all our members free. It is not, *actually not communicating* with a true Church, but *renouncing communion*, that we think makes the *Schismatick*.

But what if he discovers, "That some §. 15.
"of the principles of the Churches constituti- p. 201.
"on are not according to the mind of Christ,
"which renders the communion of it, by
"scruples, &c. not so useful to him, as if
"it were right: and that he hath declared
"his judgment and dissatisfaction; if no
"Reformation ensue &c. The question is whether he *sees*, or *conceits* he sees some *errors* in a Church *constitution*; and then whether every *want* or *redundancy* in a *Church constitution*, necessitates a *separation*: But he takes no notice, but peremptorily determines the case; "That
"person I say is doubtlesse at liberty to dis-
"pose of himself, as to particular Church
"communion, to his own best advantage.
This is *liberality* enough, and Dictator-like spoken. Does not this *open a door* to all *confusion*, in *Church* and *State*? and give every man (all as well as any) *liberty*, if they judge any thing amiss in Church or State, to turn *Reformers*, if *Superiours cannot*, or *will not Reform it*. He asks this question; "Suppose the Congregation p. 262.
"whereof a man is a member, is not refor-
"med, will not, or cannot reform it self,
"whether in this case is it Schism, for any
"number of men to reform themselves, by
"reducing the practise of worship to its ori-
"ginal

"given instruction, though the Author per-
Put it home, in a State or Nati-
Church as that of the Jews; Was it la-
ful for a few men, when State and Chu-
were all corrupted, to go and refor-
both because they who had the power
their hand, either could not, or would no
reform? I will not exemplifie it neare
home; but I think I may safely say, th
is an Arabarpistical Minister principl
at the bottome: and say no more.

§. 16. p. 263. Yet he hath Scripture for it; "I
"boldly say, this Schisme is commanded
"the Holy Ghost: What Schisme mean
he? that a man or men shall separa
from the corruptions of a Church, or re-
form themselves from the sins of the
place? that is certainly commanded.
But for that man, or a smaller number o
men, in a stated National Church, to
take upon them to reform the Church,
was never given them in command.
But see the proofs; The first is, 1 Tim.
6. 5. "From such withdraw (or separate
"thy self. But this is a great mistake, for
as the advice is given to a Minister, and
not a private member; so it is not to
withdraw from a Church, that hath some
corruptions in it, but from such false Te-
chers

bers, as its likely were of no Church. The second is, 2 *Tim.* 3. 5, *From such turn away.* Who must do it? *Timothy* a *Minister.* Again, from whom? from such loose *professors*, or *false Teachers*, as *creep into houses*, and there make *divisions*, and then *lead captive* their *Proselytes*, from the *communion* of the Church: Surely, those were not of *Timothy's* Congregation, for then he would have bidden him, not only, *turn away* from them, but *turn them* out of the Church, by a just *censure.* The last is, *Hos.* 4. 15. which is only to *dissuade* those that were of the true Church, from joyning with *Idolaters*; "*come not to Gilgal, neither* "*go up to Bethaven, &c.* for so the former part of the verse hath it, "*Though* "*thou Israel play the harlot, yet let not Ju-* "*dah offend, &c.*

But he speaks with some *Indignation*, §. 17. "*Is this a yoak laid upon me by Christ, that* p. 263. "*to go along with the multitude where I* "*live that hate to be reformed, I must for-* "*sake my duty, and despise the privileges* "*that he hath purchased for me, with his* "*own blood? Is this an unity of Christs* "*institution, that I must for ever associate* "*my self with wicked and prophane men,* "*in the worship of God? &c.* This sounds

too

[illegible] Church [illegible]

[illegible] Church [illegible]

[illegible] Church [illegible]

Church rightly constituted, for want of some Reformation in defect matters. And does not this speech insinuate so much; "That our Churches are such as "have to be reformed; and tolerate pre- "phane and wicked men, when it is our "grief that we have not power enough to "reform or expell them. They might have stayed till they had found we had *been* to be reformed; or till they had given us a *better Model* of a Church-state (which never yet, we could by our utmost importunity, obtaine from them) and then they had had some *colour* for their separation.

And yet see how *tender* he is of our Churches *honour* and *peace*; "I speak not §. 18. "this, as for a principle, that it is the duty p. 264. "of every man to separate from that "Church, wherein evil men are tolerated, &c. It is too much that he said, "every "man is at liberty in such a case, to dis- "pose of himself, as to Church-communi- "on, p. 261. though he plead it not his duty. And here again he says; "When "a Church is overborne by a multitude "of wicked and prophane, so that it cannot, "or will not reform it self, a Believer is so "far at liberty, that he may desert the com- "munion of that society, without the least

Church

Church rights, constitutions, for want of some *Reformation* in lesser matters. And does not this speech insinuate so much; "*That our Churches are such as* "*have to be reformed; and tolerate pro-*"*phane and wicked men, when it is our* "*grief that we have not power enough to* "*reform or eject them.* They might have stayed till they had found we had *hands* to be reformed; or till they had given us a *lower Model* of a Church-state (which never yet, we could by our utmost *importunity*, obtaine from them) and then they had had some *colour* for their separation.

And yet see how *tender* he is of our Churches *honour* and *peace*; "*I speak not* §. 18. "*this, as for a principle, that it is the duty* p. 264. "*of every man to separate from that* "*Church, wherein evil men are tolerated*, &c. It is too much that he said, "*every* "*man is at liberty in such a case, to dis-*"*pose of himself, as to Church-communi-*"*on*, p. 261. though he plead it not his duty. And here again he says; "*When* "*a Church is overborne by a multitude* "*of wicked and prophane, so that it cannot,* "*or will not reform it self, a Believer is so* "*far at liberty, that he may desert the com-*"*munion of that society, without the least*

"guilt of Schism." He grants him here too little; for though he defers the pure Church on earth, yet he hath told him separation from any of all Churches is no Schism. But suppose the Officers of the Church tolerate wicked men in their Communion (which is the standing plea of Separatists, a mere Communion) this is taken by them as the duty of private members; they sin in that Communion if they separate not. They will not bear with such a toleration in our Churches (though they do in their own), but hold it their duty to leap out of our Churches & practise accordingly. It were happy for us, if they had shewed some of that love and forbearance (the so oft speaks of, and required of us for themselves) to our Churches, and not reserved it all for their own.

§. 19. p. 265. The Church of Corinth had as many disorders in it, as some of ours, from which the Apostle advises no man to separate. He answers, It "The Church "of Corinth was a true Church, although "according to the mind of Christ, some "not following this knowledge by an mis- "carriage which wholly differences the "case. Why, so may the Churches of England (in some of their own confes-

sions

ons) true Churches planted according to the mind of Christ, and needed onely a Reformation, and reducing to their first constitution. But he plainly insinuates, they are no true Churches now, by reason of some miscarriages under the Papacy. He spake more openly, p. 243. "We are yet but from being cleerly delivered "from the Romane Apostacy; Rome is much beholden to him, for this courtesie, but not the Church of England. And as for those miscarriages, they were long ago, the grossest of them, much amended by the first Reformation, and more by the second and are endeavouring yet a further Reformation, if some had not obstructed it. However, Corinth had (we suppose) greater disorders in it, than are to be found (blessed be God) in many of our Congregations; why then, do they fly, and separate from us? and that before they had used all or any of the remedies of our cure, which he requires first to be done, in the next page. But hear the conclusion; "Yet this I say, had the p. 266. "Church of Corinth continued in that "condition, &c. it had been the duty (mark "that, the duty) of every Saint of God in "that Church, to withdraw from it, &c. Its strange that the Apostle did not in-

form those *Saints* of their *liberty* or *duty* there, or elsewhere. If we can have care for *sincere Christians* to be made guilty of the sins of a *Church*, where evil men are *tolerated*, or some of unsound *opinions*, are suffered (having (I mean) done their own *duty* for amending or ejecting them, according to *Matth.* 18. 15. *&c.*

§. 20. p. 267. Its true, that *Austin* was mistaken in asserting "*that* Eliah *and* Elisha, *communicated with the Israelites in their worship*, which was most *Idolatrous*, unlesse he meant that *Eliah* sacrificed once among them, at his *contest* with *Baals* Priests; or that both of them were *partakers* of the *Sacrament* of *Circumcision* with them, they and their, if they had any issue: But its as true, that our blessed *Saviour* did communicate with the *Jewes* in all the true *worship* of God; though the *Doctrine* was much corrupted, and the *worship* also by will-worship, by the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*; only protesting against those corruptions, he *communicated* in the rest, without *sin*; and neither himself *separated* from that Church, nor *advised* others so to do; (though shortly to begin the foundation of a *new Church way*) but rather

ther applied to continue it. The
Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses chaire,
whatsoever they say unto you do it, &c.

We are now drawing to an issue, of §. 21.
this discourse of *Schisme*, in the ordinary p. 268.
Acception of the Word, to signifie, *A breach of union*, which he allows to pass, (such is his *condiscension* and *confidence*,) and yet avoid the charge of *Schisme*. Thus he lies, *If we have broken no band of unity, no order instituted by Christ, we have manifestly deserted no station, that ever we were in, according to his mind, &c.* Which how *true* it is; and whether he do not hereby *asperse* all our *Churches* to be no *true Churches* of *Christs institution*, let the *Reader indifferent*, by what hath been said, be judge. *That on pure grounds of conscience, we have withdrawn or do withhold our selves from partaking in some rites, engaged into, upon meer grounds of prudence, we acknowledge.* Whether they have in their *separation* from us, gone upon *pure* and *meere* grounds of *conscience*, God and their own hearts must determine the business. The world is too apt to judge otherwise upon shrewd *suspicions* and *premises* of theirs. And suppose they have withdrawn themselves from some rites of *prudence*,

in some of our *Churches*. (Suppose he means it of *Churches of Separation*) yet they have withdrawn themselves also from some *Congregations* (not so united) that have only the *pure Institutions* of Christ; and that may bring the charge of *Schism* upon them. But have not they also gone upon some *meere grounds* of *prudence* (or policy)? Is there any *Institution* of Christ, that they must *gather* members out of true *Churches* to make a purer *Church* (if so it be)? Or is there any *Institution* of Christ, that a *Minister*, who is *married* to a people, (as they hold) should *relinquish* it, for a place of greater *eminency* or *preferment*? Or that people must be *tyed* to their *Pastors*, by an *explicite Covenant*, not to depart without *their leave humbly desired*? Or (to add no more) Is there any *Institution* of Christ in expreſs words, that *Churches* particular must ſend their *Delegates* to an *Aſſembly*, to determine matters of *common* concernment? which he granted above. These, and ſome more of their *known marks*, the world takes to be but *products* of humane *prudence*: and he may do well to ſhew their *Inſtitutions*.

§. 22. Yet have we more of this *confidence*,

"Tis commonly, and truly objected, §. 23.
There is a difference between *Reforming* p. 269.
of Churches, already *gathered*, and *raising*

of Churches out of mere nothing
Surely this is evident enough to any
of a Church out of nothing and reducing
a corrupted Church to its first
This he first saies
asks. What's the English of this, if he
would speak out? Why then truth is,
We have no Churches and they stoop to
repairing an old house, than building a
new from the ground. But hear him say
something. "I have no other Reformation
"tion of any Church or any thing in it,
"the reducing of it to its primitive institu-
"tion, &c. We say so too. Grant us to
be Churches: Reformation of a Church
or any thing in it, presupposes there is
a Church existent, though perhaps rent
and ruinous. But these New-builders will
gather a Church out of no Churches, and
begin a new one. It had been happy
for old England if they had all gone into
New England, and laid the foundation of
their Churches amongst the Indians and
not to build upon other mens foundati-
ons; and then tell us, they are building
of stuff and frame new Churches. And
does not this hold forth, that we are no
Churches, and our members no members
of a Church, till they come into their's?
But yet more to discover his very design

"when

p. 379.

this at once to be effected in all the Churches of England since the Reformation? for we know, that in the Reign of the Brethren they were less capable of that Reduction. And what capacity our Churches are now in for that Reduction; partly by want of power, and assistance from the Magistrate, without which some dare not see upon a Reformation, for fear of a prejudice: partly by our Divisions amongst our selves, fomented by he knows whom; he cannot but see as well as we know it. But if we must be denied to see it, because we are not in such a capacity, and cannot do all we would, therefore then, we are in a sad condition! What if a Church want some things she had at her first institution, perhaps of no great concernment, (or be it great) but either by the prohibition of the present powers, or the opposition of a prevalent party, it is but now capable of Reduction to its primitive Institution;

Will

Will he look upon this Society, as no Church of Christ, and think, no wise man in that Society, or other shall be preserved to Angels all men in damnation? And for such the more when as upon this ground, we are in danger to lose all our best Ministers, for to be advised, whereupon, I shall raise these two, who have a clear right to the privileges, put these first, that Christ in the Gospel doth invite such, who have no visible Church-estate, to make them so, and to partake of them. That to come out from among them, and join themselves to some Independent Congregation.

§. 24. p. 270. To raise the former objection, one of his way as profane, for he tells him, He must manage principles, which his Disciples he hath made occasion to disown, as [illegible] I cannot but make a question (and so I think with many more) that he would be pleased to do it the more forth, and manage those principles to their utmost clearness and strength, which this discourse of mine and some former, have given him just occasion to produce, that we might be once disposed, with the light of that Model of Christ

was,

way, so often *desired*, so often promised, and as often unfaithfully *denied*. We professe our selves *utterly unsatisfied* with what hath yet been vouchsafed us to see. But he will tell us briefly *what are the things of great and weighty importance, which must come under debate, before either account can be given of the case stated in the Objection.* Before we hear them, I cannot but say they have dealt the more *unbrotherly* with us, (to say no more) and all the *Reformed* Churches abroad, in setting up their way of new *Churches*, and never discovered to us, sufficiently, the *grounds* of their so doing: Let him look back to what he said p. 7. *The parties litigant, &c.* But we shall attend him for the particular *Heads*.

"1. *The true nature of an Instituted* §. 25.
"*Church, under the Gospel, as to the matter,*
"*form, and all other necessary constitutive*
"*causes, is to be investigated and found out.*

To which I say, 1. This (I thought) had *Are there any constitutive causes, besides matter and form?* been fully done, if not by all *Reformed* Churches, yet by those of *New England*, who have done what they could, to *clear causes*, on their way. The *constituting causes* (I say besides they) are *matter* and *form*; the *matter*, *Matter visible Saints*; the *form*, an *explicite Co-* *& Form?* *venant*,

adopted, of all the members. But (as
have been told) they have condemned
themselves, by requiring an explicite con-
sent, and yet confessing an implicite to be
sufficient, and this to be in our Churches,
and yet separate from us. 2. I have
shewed in my answer of the particular
Church, given above, and
out all the constituting causes of such
Church; *A visible society of men, called*
*unto the unity of the Faith*
*Christ, and to the performance of the*
*duty of God, in the same Individual Or-*
*dinances, according to their profession*
*by Christ.* Such Churches are ours, in
all the particular Dimensions of this de-
finition, as was shewed above. All that
can be objected, is but to the last parti-
cle, *according to the order by Christ pre-*
*scribed*, which is the question between
us, & must not be begged, on either side,
but proved, and it concerns him to shew
the contrary. What Ordinances do we
want? or what have we of humane addi-
tions? And as for our *joynt consent*,
(though we have it implicitely, yet) suffici-
ently it is not in his definition, which yet
is one of the constituting causes of their
Church. If then the definition of such
a Church, be as applicable to our Chur-

ches,

ches, as to his own, we are true-insti-
tuted Churches; and churches that be
Schismatick in renouncing communion
with us, is the whole Christian Church
be Judge. And I go on thus. [illegible]
"The nature and form of such a Church, is to be exemplified from the Scripture, and the state of the first Churches, before sensible infection with the pestilence of Apostacy which ensued. This hath abundantly been done, by the Assembly, and other Divines, (though he is not pleased to take notice of it) and we dare joyn issue with him in this debate, whensoever he will begin it. 2. The extent of the Apostacy under Antichrist, as to the number of instituted Churches, making them as to Babylon, and their members proportionally, is duly and carefully to be examined. Here lyes our disease, here are darknesse and thraldome, and if we shall not easily shake our selves out of the dust." I suppose he does not mean this dust of his own Churches, they are not only risen, but have shaken off the very dust of that Apostacy; I shall not contradict him for his own particular Church, because I am a stranger to it, but of some of the Churches of the same constitution, I dare confidently affirm, they are fallen again into the old Apo-

p. 26.

p. 271.

stacy,

...fallen in matters of Doctrine, and have more to discover upon their garments than upon our shaven. But we shall be ready to put our selves upon the search; and if it may appear, that yet we retain any thing of that Apostacy, we shall promise faithfully to endeavour it. But I am very jealous, he impedes a finer and a higher Reformation, than we dare look for, in this world, till Christ himself come to Reign visibly on earth; as some do expect he will ere long. Viz. by Revelation of the Spirit. He speaks suspitiously this way; p. 42. "When the order, spirituality, beauty, and glory of the Church of Christ shall perish, &c. these assertions will have no issue." And again p. 70. "When God shall have reduced his Church to their primitive purity, &c. And once more p. 000. "So soon as Christs Churches are shaken out of the dust of Babylon, with his glory shining on them, &c.

§. 27. p. 271. "By what way and means, God hath preserved and kept alive his elect, in their several generations, when Antichristian darkness covered the earth, supposing an interruption of Institued Ordinances, is not to make it manifest in them, as to what means of simple institution, &c. he may be well to enquire and resolve us." He can not

not but know, that there are many learned men, that will not grant him this supposition, that it is a sin for all instituted Ordinances so far as they make a nullity in them. And something hath been said to this above, which he may do well to consider. The sum is this, "That if "there was an utter interruption, and so a "nullity of all instituted Ordinances, it was "impossible to fix the Tabernacle of God "with men again, without a miracle or "some Divine Revelation." As for the *Bohemian* brethren, concluding the whole *Papacy* to be purely *Antichristian*, it is not a singular conceit, for all *reformed Churches* are of that opinion. They distinguish the *Papacy*, (which is as a scab or *Leprosie* to the hand) from the *Church of Rome*; making the former purely *Antichristian*, but not the latter. But as (perhaps erroneously; for *Luther* and his associats did not so) they could not allow of the *Ordination of Ministers* by any in communion with them: So they were (perswaded of a necessity of continuing that Ordinance, in a way of succession; which whether our Author does, let him declare, when he takes into consideration the *Bohemian* cases. They send to the *Greek* and *Armenian* Churches, and have

§. 28.
p. 272.

conscience to concurr with them, their practice does condemn as sinful, and so lay a bar in the way of the Church's not having Officers, but planting and gathering up a new Church, and renouncing their principles.

6. Whether ordinary Officers be before, or after the Church, and whether a Church-state is preserved, in the preservation of Officers for a gift to that Church: or the Office be preserved, and consequently the Officers, in the preservation, and reconstitution of a Church, is the last thing of importance to be considered. For the first, whether ordinary Officers, were before the Church, hath been discussed elsewhere. Reasons may be given on both sides; sometimes the Church, is before the ordinary Officer viz. when one dying another succeeds to that Church in his room. Sometimes the ordinary Officer is before the Church a in the gathering of a Church out of Heathens. Mr. Eliot in New-England, an ordinary Officer, he converts and baptizes many Indians, and gathers them into a Church: I hope they do not preach for extraordinary Officers now as the Bakers of late did. I know his exception above; This is in ecclesia constituenda, not in ecclesia constituta: but

I shall give him another instance, suppose a *Minister* comes young to a people, lives till all the *ancient* people he found there be *deceased*; All that remain in the Parish, were *admitted* by him into the Church, by *baptism*, here the *Officer* is before the Church, in a Church *constituted*. But this is as very a *nicity* as which is first, the *Hen* or the *Egg*. I perceive what he aimes at in the second question; "*Whether a Church-state is preserved in the Officer, or the Officer in the constitution of a Church*. He upon his *principles* must hold the *latter* part; for he holds, that no man is an *Officer* out of his *own Church*; if either the *Church* be destroyed, or he *removed* from it, he *ceases* to be an *Officer*, whence it follows, that 1. No *Minister* quâ *Minister*, can convert the Heathens. 2. That if all *Church-state* be lost, it cannot be raised up by an *Officer*, who is *strange* to that Church as he speaks here. The *result* is, according to his principles, the *Office* first, and then the *Officers* inclusively, is preserved in the *constitution* of a Church: As now? A company of single *Christians*, may meet, and joyn themselves in a *Church* state; which done they may, out of themselves (for other

*Churches*

*See pag. 199. They who will not be contented, &c.*

*To the Anabaptists, confess. art. 36.*

Churches of Ministers, are forbidden to to them) chuse them Officers, and set them down by fasting and Prayer? This is pretty, and never exemplified in an ordinary Election other day. But be for-for the main Premisse, that he supposes all Church-state lost; but these Christians joyning together are supposed to be Baptized, which is a part of a Church-state, and without which they could never make a Church, much lesse an Officer, as was discovered above. To raise up and restore a decayed Church-state, in an ordinary way, there is but one of these wayes; either a Minister in Office must Baptize converted Heathens, and so make them a Church; or a company of Baptized persons when no Minister is to be found, must for once, joyn and chuse themselves Officers (which comes near to an extraordinary case, and not among us now to be made use of): but yet still, the Church-state depends upon the Ministry originally, that Baptized them, and not upon those people, supposed them Ministers. But more of this above. When he takes those important things, he speaks of, into his difficulties, let him take those things, by me pro-

pounded, into consideration also, as things of some importance.

§. 29. p. 273. The task undertaken, is now at issue; The miscarriages that he speaks of, "as ensuing for want of a due and right apprehension of the thing (that is Schism) have been now long exercised in the consideration of, may with no more ease than truth, be rolled back upon himself. "It is not impossible, that he may begin "apprehend, that he hath been too hasty in "judging our Churches to be none, and himself and his party no Schismaticks in separating from them, as no Churches. And it may perhaps appear to him, that he is the man, if that is ever ready to "charge highly, than whom to make good "his charge. The Schisms that have ensued, "by their causeless imputation of "a no-Church-state among us, and setting up new Churches is too well known. And being in one fault of renouncing communion with us, he hath now confirmed himself, and his party in it, by a new, but false notion of Schism, which none of his Predecessors, had the hap to stumble upon. I might parallel the rest, in that Section but I forbear, and leave it to the Reader.

2. In these *differences*, about the *way* §. 30.
of *Religion*, we have endeavoured, "*to* p. 275.
"*derive them to their Rise and Spring*, and
find *Schism* to be as *formidable* in its
first *Original*, in respect of its *terminus*
*a quo*, as in the *Issues*, though much
*increased* by many generations, in regard
of the *terminus ad quem*. And I cannot
but observe, how he seems to *extenuate*
the crime of *Schism* (before aggravated)
by his *comparisons*. *Schism* at its first
rise, and Scripture notion, (if he *mistake*
not) was but a *little Spring*; but swelled
to a great breadth, by mens *disputations*
about it. Hear his *swelling* words, "*What*
"*a stock of abominations doth Schism seem*
"*to be, as rolling down to us through the*
"*writings of Cyprian, Austin, and Optatus*
"*of old, &c. Go to its rise, and you will*
"*find it quite another thing*. As if he
had said, *Schism* is not so *formidable a*
*thing* as it's made (by all but himself)
if you would but take it for some *petty*
*differences within one Assembly*; the
charge of it is not so dreadful as some
would make it. For to he adds: "*Whilst* p. 276.
"*I have an unto controllable faithful witness,*
"*that I do not willingly break any unity of*
"*the institution of Christ. Whilst I dis-*
"*turb not the Peace of that particular* p. 277.

"Church, whereof by my own consent, I am
"a member, and desire to walk in communion
"with, and subjection unto, as to any
"to fellowship in order of the Gospel, while I
"labour to exercise faith towards the Lord
"Jesus Christ, and love towards all the
"Saints, I do keep the unity which is of the
"appointment of Christ, and declined
"not from principles merely forreign
"to the Gospel, what they please to say or can to
"the contrary, I am no Schismatick. That
is, though by raising differences, I let all
the Churches of England on fire, I am no
Schismatick, if I withdraw not the peace of
my own particular Church, How true and
reasonable the particulars of this confession
are, let the impartial Reader judge.

§. 31. p. 277. 3. I still return him his own words, with a very little change, "Perhaps this
"discovery which hath been made how
"much he and his party are concerned in
"that charge of Schism upon which
"is the greatest high-way of sinning this day in
"England, (with respect to the Church)
"may be a means effectually under God to
"reconcile them to the unity of the Church, although
"engaged in several ways." I can heartily
say Amen to this: but yet must add what

follows

[illegible] have not any great hope of [illegible] success in that account, whilst men [illegible] are so strongly prejudiced, and have [illegible] their affections engaged thereunto. &c. But all [illegible] are in the hand of God, &c.

§. 32. To conclude; *what vain janglings men are daily engaged in, who will lay their own false hypotheses, (such as the common notion of Schism is) as a ground of further procedure, is in part evinced by what hath been delivered.* Hence in that dangerous dispute, 1. Which is first, the *Church*, or its *Officers*? 2. Whether a man may be a *member* that is not a *member* of a particular Church? 3. Whether the *members* of one Church, may *partake* of the *Sacraments* in another Church, and that of the same constitution? 4. Whether the *child* of a *scandalous* person, may be baptized by the *Minister* of that Church? 5. Whether our Churches be true Churches, our members, true members, because not gathered by an *explicit Covenant*? Which as it was never doubted of by *Non-conformists* at home, or any *Reformed* Churches abroad, till *Brownists* arose; so it may be concluded from his own words, in his conclusion.

p. 279. "He is a member of no particular Church,
"who having been in a due order joyned
"thereunto, doth after voluntarily desert
"it, nor been judicially ejected out of it.
But I assume, The *members* of our *particular* Churches have been in a due order joyned thereunto, and have not voluntarily have deserted them, nor been judicially ejected out of them; Therefore they are true *members* of particular Churches, and consequently our Churches are true Churches: and by a further consequence,
"They that raise differences in them, and
"draw disciples from them, and renounce
"communion with them, (for that what
"pleases or suits the corrupt desires
"sticks) Quod erat demonstrandum.

---

"of Parents and people diligently
"lected, and highly commended by
"Reverend and judicious Mr. Joseph
"Written with much clearness
"judgement and wonderful attention of Spirit, put
forth in the year 1644. By comparing
whereof, with this of his, of Schism,
perceive, that wife and judicious men
are still but men, subject to mistake;
and therefore had need of some of the
policy or prudence, of the five Apologists
not to be too peremptory in their

# AN APPENDIX TO The former Discourse of Schism;

## Shewing, the inconstancy of the Dr. and the inconsistency of his former and present Opinions.

§. 1. Since my finishing of the former Discourse there came happily to my hands, a Book of the *Learned Doctors*, entitled, "*The duty of Pastors, and people distinguished*, licensed, and highly commended, by the Reverend, and *judicious* Mr. *Joseph Caryl*; as, "*Written with much clearnesse of* "*judgment, and moderation of Spirit*. put forth in the year 1644. By comparing whereof, with this of his, of *Schism*, I perceive, that wise and judicious men, are still but men, subject to mistakes; and therefore had need of some of the *policy* or *prudence*, of the five *Apologists*; not to be too *peremptory* in their *new opi-*

*Apol. Narr. pag.* 11.

*nions*,

*Jam.* 1. 8.

which is the principal change we look for in
[illegible] Which willing
that the Reader and his patrimony may do
I shall only present to him some few of
his former thoughts, from whence he may
[illegible] they are the true Mother of
such [illegible]
Such is the Tract of this strain designed to §. 2.
discover the difference between the Pastors
and their people, whereby the sacred rul- pag. 2.
ing may retain its ancient dignity, and
the people of God not deprived of their
Christian liberty. For in former times,
before us, the Synod would have all Chri-
stians to be almost Ministers; others
were but Ministers to the Gods Clergy:
These would give the people the Keys;
Those would take them away out of the
Church: Here are ascribing to them pri-
marily all Ecclesiastical power for the
ruling of the Congregation, the other
abridging them of spiritual duties, for
the building up of their own souls: Here
things were so huddled, that almost the pa-
stor of Dorchester called them the rock
of Democratical confusion, and the rock
of Hierarchical tyranny. Who these
parties were, it needs not to de-
clare, only it may be observed, when
these our Brethren had not fallen into
that very pit of Democratical confusion,
by

by flying from the rock of Ecclesiastical tyranny. I leave it to his consideration, whether it is that, in a true sense, he sets out the liberty of the people, that they may not, under a pretence of Christian liberty, invade the dignity of the sacred calling of the Ministry. And much he grants to the people, both under the Law and Gospel. "Wherein (he adds) that "they abstain from flagrant the exercise or "ordinary such chief things which more ap- "propriated to the office of the Priests, p. 37. or of the Ministers p. 46. except they can shew some extraordinary call or case, for their so doing: p. 48. of which he that delivers his opinion, and states the question, "In cases extraordinary, it may "perhaps be affirmed that every Christian "is so far a Minister of the Gospel, as to "teach and declare the faith as occasion al- "though he have no ordinary calling thereto "unto him, only he must declare all from "God. All I say, (for the charge of his opinion is, That he allows private persons liberty more in cases extraordinary, as will appear hereafter.

§. 3. The question then will be in cases extraordinary, what a Church is much degenerated, and corrupted, what may ordinary Christians do then to the Re-

Restauration of Religion? Concerning which, his judgement was (what ever it be now) thus delivered, and relied upon;

"That ruin'd, collapsed and corrupted state of pag. 15.
"the Church, when the ordinary Teachers
"are either naturally ignorant, and unable, or
"negligent, and will not perform their duty,
"Gift in any one to be a Teacher, and con-
"sent in others, by him to be taught,
"are sufficient warrant for the per-
"formance of it. That is, the duty of teaching
or preaching. But more expresly: p. 40.
"In such a case (of Apostacy in the
"Church) I conceive he may, nay he ought,
"to preach and publish the truths discove-
"red to him, whether he stay either out of a
"safe capacity to continue him a Preacher
"of the Gospel, than the consent of Gods
"people to be instructed by him. I will
only remember him, That as he spake
this of a lay man in Italy, (for that is his
instance) so he did not then take Rome to
be no Church at all, as now he does; but
a ruin'd, collapsed and corrupted Church: but
that by the bye. That which I observe is
1. That he is not distinct enough in these
Assertions; for if he mean, that in such a
falling state of a Church, when it is p. 16.
"grievously declining, every one of Gods
"servants hath a sufficient warrant to help

*Doing it as a charitable duty, not as out of necessary function; even as Priscilla (a woman) expounded unto Apollos the word of God, &c. pag. 50. f.*

Gifts and consent to elect one another for their Officers? Herein his discourse was dark and deceived them also, as the people of the Jews were, by obscuring or abolishing the truths of the Gospel in such a case: but tells us not, whether such a Preacher be a compleat Minister, as to the administration of other Ordinances, as the Sacrament? Now, by word or deed, I suppose, then he did not intend so much, but now (so is he changed) he allows some that were never Ordained, and himself who hath renounced his Ordination, not only to preach the Gospel, but also to administer Sacraments as compleat Ministers, in the name of Christ. Let them fear and tremble, to hear one day those questions, "By what "authority do you these things? or who "gave you this authority? Is it a dreadfull speech of his own, p. 16. "Whereupon "doth any thing in another stead, not by "expresse power from him, is a plain Impo-"stor. And yet how many such Impostors are there abroad, who take upon them, without commission from Christ, or authority from the Church, not only to preach, but to baptize and give the Lords Supper? I have heard a sad story of a forward man, that did so, and fell into

into [illegible] Gifts, and [illegible] such there are. [illegible] sent, having neither Gifts, nor [illegible] people? The Lord lay it to [illegible] and to the [illegible] them in it, as guilty of [illegible] them, and the great [illegible] *stated calling* of the Ministry. Lastly, however it might be sufficient in an *extraordinary state* of a corrupted Church, to make a man a *Minister*, to have such *Gifts* and *consent* of the people; (which was all the Dr. then asserted) yet that these should be sufficient in an *ordinary Reformed Church-state*, is his [illegible] opinion; unless they can [illegible] *extraordinary signs* of such [illegible] from God, which they cannot do: For he speaks rationally below, when he says, *p. 34.* *We are certain enough, that God never sent any to age extraordinarily, (unstalled only with ordinary Gifts and for an ordinary end.* But these his new Preachers, have no more than *ordinary Gifts*, (some of them not so much) wherein others are their *equals*, if not Superiors; and their end is no more but *ordinary*, the *ordinary* [illegible] souls, and feeding the Ordinances in purity: Then it follows, that these being

not

§. 4.

[illegible] Spirit, that so [illegible] the soul of [illegible] Body with it, to be [illegible] things must be taken [illegible] else they may prove [illegible] Ans. 3. Christ took upon him our nature *essentially*; but he bestows his flesh and blood upon us *spiritually* and *mystically*. 4. The union of the two natures in *Christ* was proper and *personal*, into one person *hypostatically*; as the soul and body in us, make one man: But the union of many *persons* with Christ, is not into one *nature* properly; but *mystically* into one *person*, We are *members* of his *body*, *flesh*, *bones*, but *mystically*; otherwise, the *union* of many *persons* into one *nature*, should be like that of Christs two *natures*, into one person hypostatically: And like unto the union of the three persons in the Trinity, into the same *nature* or *essence*, which is incomprehensible. 3. We are made parts of him, of his *mystical body*, that he and we become thereby, as it were (that is improperly and *mystically*) one Christ. 4. We are made partakers

of the Divine nature, not *essentially* and *personally*, as Christ; but in its *graces* and *operations*: as generally all *Divines* understand it; *renewed* by the *Spirit*, into that *Divine Image*, which we had by nature, but lost by the fall. 5. The same Spirit is indeed in Christ, and in us, but with this *assigned* difference. In him dwelleth the *fulness* of it, (*fulness of grace and truth*, Joh. 1. 14.) it is bestowed on us in *measure*. 6. This same Spirit makes us one with him, that is, still *mystically*, not as the *Soul* of man being one, makes with *the body* one man; for that is hypostatically and *personally* one. The words thus expounded, and *candyed*, may passe for *Orthodox*; otherwise not to be admitted. But now in his Tract of *Schism*, he is declined into that *Heterodox* p. 94. of *opinion*, (so judged by most and best Di- Schism. vines) that the *holy Spirit*, dwells *personally* and *essentially* in us. For 1. he tells us, he cannot consent, that the *Divine nature* given us, should be no more than the *new creature*. 2. That it is in *the person of the Spirit*, whereof we are by the promise made partakers, he is the Spirit of promise; and in the participation of pag. 95. the Divine nature consists the union of

the Saints with Christ. 3. *That the union of the head and members is the union of the Soul, wherein the whole mystical body is united; and that which supplies the place of the Soul in the mystical body of Christ, is the illumination of the whole by the Spirit.* Now every body knows, that the Soul is the *form* of a man, and the *union* of Soul and Body, is *personal*; So then in the union of Christ, and his body, the Church, be *personal*, as animated by the same Spirit, if the *person* of the *Holy Spirit*, be the Soul, that animates the body of Christ; and so he saies it is, *The form of the Church Catholick, absolutely so called, being union with Christ, and in him by the Spirit whereby it is animated.* I shall not enter upon the controversie it self, (it being a *digression* to the main business) enough to shew the *difference* of himself from himself, then and now.

p. 236.

§. 5. We now return (after this digression) to consider, with him, the *reasons* and *signs*, of an *extraordinary vocation*, which some of late pretend unto. There is surely one thing briefly to be taken notice of, that is, *whether the ministry of the Gospel are by the Scripture to be called Priests*, which name some have arrogated and

and ascribed to the Clergy. Of which he
saith peremptorily, The name of p. 25.
Priest is nowhere in the Scripture attributed directly to the Administers of the Gospel: Priests (and Prelates) are a sort of Church Officers, whom Christ never appointed. Thus were his then thoughts, and its like are to still; only I would desire to know, why he gives that name (first supposed in scorn) to the Administers of our particular Congregations, calling them Parochial Priests: or Schism? I leave him to give, or others to guesse the reason of that Appellation, and do proceed to what I named before.

§. 6. 1.) There are but three waies given by him whereby we are allured that a man is ordinarily called to the Teaching of others, or to be a Preacher; 1. By immediate Revelation. 2. By concurrence of Scripture Rules. 3. By some outward p. 30.
providence. Concerning which in generality it may be said, 1. That p. 28.
he thus resolved of extraordinary callings, must be assumed, that every one that is allowed to teach or preach the Gospel, for such an undertaking, must have a warrant by an immediate call from God.

"God. But of all his three ways named, only one of them, is by *immediate* call from God; viz. that of *immediate Revelation*; such as the *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, and *Apostles* had: the other, by *Rule of Scripture*; and the two *providential*, are but *mediate calls*, or warrants, and may be common to all *Christians*, as the case may be. 2. Before this, p. 19. and again p. 40. In such *extraordinary* cases of a corrupt Church, &c. no more is required, but *Gifts* in the man, and *consent* of the people; which latter is an *outward* call, and that by men; and the former, a call from God, *inward* indeed, but not *immediate*. These things do not well agree.

§. 7. But come to the particulars. The first way of *extraordinary calling* is *immediate Revelation*. This is specially in two cases, p. 33. "1. *Either the inclination of some* "*divine works to be effected among men,* "*by a new revelation of God's will*; or 2. *Or a* "*restauration of the same, when collapsed* "*and corrupted by men.* The only question will be, "*Whether there be any such* "*vision to be expected now, with respect to* "*either of those.* And he answers negatively to both. To the first thus, "*No-*

"Nothing in such a way shall go amisse
"where God having already revealed his
"mind concerning his worship and our sal-
"vation. To the second thus: "There
"being an infallible Rule for the perform-
"ance of it, making it fall within the duty
"and ability of men undertakers of an ordi-
"nary vocation, and inriched with ordina-
"ry Gifts, God doth not always immediate-
"ly call men unto it." But grant that he doth not always immediatly call men to it (as at the beginning he did heretofore) it would have been resolved, "whether sometimes "God do now immediatly call men to the "work of the Reformation of Religion?" To which he saies nothing: If he shall say, he does not, he contradicts himself, who said p. 28. "In this case of a corrupt-"ted Church, every one for such an un-"dertaking must have a warrant by an "immediate call from God." If he say he does sometimes immediatly now call men to it, I would say, 1. This is needless, by his own grant. For there being an infallible rule, it falls within the duty and ability of men undertakers of an ordinary vocation, inriched with ordinary Gifts, as he newly said. 2. And then I would call for those signs and evidences

p. 34.

cation. These he makes to be "a sufficient [illegible] of his calling to the work of the ministry, [illegible] "things present, as shall make it evident to [illegible] "ordinary [illegible] "speaking with Tongues, &c. working [illegible] "of Miracles, &c. none of which being now to be found, he concludes, from

P. 41. f. Who ever pretends unto it, not warranted by an evidence of one of these three ways, which God taketh in such procedings, is but a pretender, an impostor, and to be rejected of all Gods people.

our new Reformers or Reformers, who yet plead the Revelation of the Spirit, and take themselves [illegible] called by God, to make [illegible] upon the presence of a collapsed and [illegible] state of this one Church. Any [illegible] of these being now to be found among them, they prove themselves to be [illegible] impostors, and those that [illegible] countenance them [illegible] their impostures. And whether [illegible] himself have not [illegible] these [illegible] our Orthodox [illegible] The [illegible] supposing an [illegible] all true Church-state [illegible] to do in this [illegible] above, whether it may [illegible] pains and expence [illegible] from God to be [illegible] Reformation of a Church [illegible]

when

when they would set a value upon their
Charity, by which I proceed to the
[illegible]

The end [illegible] of extraordinary call to §. 8.
preach the Gospel, is, by a concurrence p. 37.
of supernatural Reason, drawing men from
gross precepts, to approved practise:
The practice is such as tends Luke 20.
to [illegible] strengthen thy brethren
[illegible] Jesus saith, thy way err from
thy self or Matth. 5. A candle is
not to be put under a bushel, &c. Whence
he infers, There is a general obliga- p. 38.
tion to all Christians to promote the con-
version and edification of sinners, &c.
Whatsoever truth is necessary is revealed
in the word of God, but before known,
[illegible] to be acknowledged, &c. Truth
revealed, carries with it an unmoveable
persuasion to the conscience, that it ought to
be published. To the first of these, it
may be said, this is not an immediate
call (which he required above), but me-
diate by the word. Nor yet an extraor-
dinary call, to some particular men, but
an ordinary obligation on all Christians;
Nor only in extraordinary cases of a cor-
rupted Church, but ordinary in the best
Church:

Church: Nor is this sufficient to make any man a Teacher, or ordinary instructer of others, common to all Christians, men, and women. To the second, it had need be warranted well, not only, because it may either be Truth, which he thinks to, or no truth, and so not fit to disturb the peace of a Church for it; but also, because upon this pretence of truth, every man must take unrestricted liberty to speak in the Church: which will breed confusion. Himself therefore adds, Provided the [illegible] declaration [illegible] Church wherein he liveth [illegible] Church doth allow. But this is part of the [illegible] liberty, if [illegible] hinder him [illegible] corrupt Church, which will not allow, but condemn that liberty, how shall he then do? For he thinks I doubt not to say, That [illegible] of conscience, which is [illegible] obligatory, that it ought to be published to others. And so error in us have as much liberty as truth. However it is clear Rulers bind in ordinary as well as extraordinary

disciples of a Church; and given authority to make many Preacher.

§. 9. 11. The examples are of our Saviour himself, who preached in the Synagogues without any outward call: and of those Acts 8. 4. who being scattered abroad, went every where preaching the word; so did Paul and Apollos, &c. For our Saviour, his call was immediate and extraordinary; So was Paul's, an Apostle: Apollos was at first no more a Preacher, than Aquila and Priscilla, who instructed him in the way, as one Christian may do another: As for those Acts 8. 4. its made more than probable, by others, that they were Elders of the Church, and Preachers by Office: If some were not, they did no more, than any Christian may do in such cases, and yet never be Preachers. And all this, in a reformed Church state, ordinarily; and so it is to the purpose.

§. 10. For the 12. remember, that he was to shew, when it might make and justifie a lay-man to be a Preacher of the Gospel, in an extraordinary case, without an ordinary outward call from the Church; and required no more, but Gifts and parts of people to be instructed by him,

him? ... In these instances ... though they had ... sufficient ... preached the word, when they had not ... the senses of people so to hear, or be instructed by them: and in every one that hath the ... revealed unto him, whether they will ... his main design is to discover, when a man, no Minister, may ... when a Church is ... Lapsed, or corrupted; the ordinary Ministers, either so ... they cannot, or so ... they will not ... the truth, p. 15. And of such a ... Church, he here puts the case, ... p. 40. "a ... "Apostacy, ... "hath ... "as in Israel (... ") the Lord ... "sent ... "Levites ... "... Truly, there is no difficulty in this case. I conceive we may ... have so much confidence ... when and where he can find one that will hear him: But the question is, "whether this, ipso facto, makes

" makes him a Preacher in Office? A wo-
man is a Christian amongst Christians, may
and ought to do much at this day, yet I hope
no Christian Gospeller in the least
tenders, that she has the Office to preach Christ,
and gospel-ministry to be instructed by
her. And unless she have [illegible] in the
latter sense, he cannot [illegible] them,
whatever notion he [illegible] other outward
[illegible] Preach-
ing of the Gospel, that the consent of
the Congregation be [illegible] by him. A
[illegible] (as we then) cannot
[illegible] this: unless he can suppose a time
[illegible] there is no Ministry to
be had, and then, but [illegible], nei-
[illegible] hold. Per-
haps these [illegible] of his then said,
[illegible] and finished, pre-
tending to [illegible] finding a people
willing to be [illegible] by him, or them,
to [illegible] and separating from
our Churches by [illegible] of a Church,
[illegible] yea,
this is evident that he now proceeds up-
on those [illegible] nothing is re-
quired to make [illegible], but [illegible] and
[illegible] of people without any outward
call of the Church, which we shall pre-
sently

fently bear, before any thing required thereunto. And this made him so cautious in stating the case of our first Reformers, Luther, Calvin, &c. when he says, "Within "I was altogether satisfied, that Luther "deserved all serious discussion upon the "outward account of our first Reformers, "altogether blameless." But, by this leave, the case of Luther was not (as he says) exactly that which he laid down. For he is speaking of a Layman, by that way to be constituted a Preacher of Ministers; but Luther was a Minister ordained; (though with much corruption) and so had an outward call by the Church, to preach the Gospel in the then purity of it; and I believe our Brethren, did then think him to be a Minister of Christ, but his present principles (not Luther's case, in regard of the corrupted state of the Church, and the manner of spirit wherein he managed it, was extraordinary) but his call was ordinary, as an ordained Minister.

3. The people who fell off from Babylon, with him; were in Church-state (though corrupted) as baptized persons, and had a command to come out of Babylon; but the people that our Brethren now gather, come rather out of Sects, as have no

p. 41.

call

call to separate from my brethren? command not to preach? 3. Luther did not renounce his Ordination, in the Church of Rome; nor his people theirs Baptism; nor did our brethren formerly, think it requisite: but now he hath renounced his Ordination, and former Ministry; and upon his principle of gifts and consent of the people, made himself a Minister: and it is expected, that ere long his people (if not himself) will renounce their Baptism, both of them standing, or falling together. And so I come to the last way.

The third and last way of an extraordinary call to preach the Gospel, without an ordinary mission, is by some act of providence. The instances, "of a Christian §. 11. Ibid. "man cast by shipwrack, or otherwise, a-"mong barbarous people, who receive him "hospitably: must he not, ought he not, to "preach the Gospel unto them? and if he "converts souls, may he not become a Pa-"stour to those converted? none I hope, "makes doubt of it. But suppose a Christian woman, should be cast upon the same place, (as once among the Iberians) ought she not (by his former principles) to preach the Gospel to them? no doubt but she

she ought: For if the converts should there may she be [illegible] not a *Pastor* to them? none, I think, will say so: 2. But we have put him a case elsewhere, of his own making; Suppose a *Mahometan* should find the Scripture, and be converted by it alone: he being converted, converts others: I ask now, may he become a *Pastor* to those converts? I hope he will not say he may, till he be *baptized*, nor can they make a *Church* till they be baptized: but who shall baptize either him or them, having no *Minister* there? This, while a *Presbyterian* he would not have granted, nor may now by his *Independent principles* deny, till he is turned *Anabaptist*. 3. We read of men in the *primitive* times (as well as that woman) who, being no *Ministers*, converted the *Indians* and *Moors*; but they neither did nor could be their *Pastors*, not *baptize* them, till they were *ordained* in the *Christian* Church, and sent to do it. If *consent* of people and *elders* would have constituted them *Ministers*, they needed not to have come home so many *hundred miles*, to fetch their *Ordination*? See but the difference between himself a *Presbyterian*, and now an *Independent*: but enough of that.

*Socrat. hist. l. 1. c. 15. 16.*

And

And thereby Author of his 3 Presby- §. 12.
terians informers, and that upon good de-
liberation, and strong resolution so to
continue, we have his own acknowledg-
ment, when thus he writes: "The prin- p. 42.
"ciples and rules of that Church Govern-
"ment from which in the following asser-
"tions I desire not to wander, is of that
"same mould I do, and always in my poor
"judgment have adhered, since by Gods
"assistance, I had engaged my self to the
"study of his word, which is commonly
"called Presbyterial, or Synodical, in op-
"position to Prelatical or Dioceſan, on the
"one side, and that which is commonly
"called Independent, or Congregational on
"the other." Quantum mutatus ab illo! in his Tract of Schism.

And this he discovered in the requi- §. 13.
sites, which Presbyterian Government
holds forth, (in ordinary cases) to con-
stitute a Minister: for thus he saies:
"For a publick, formal, ministerial tea- p. 46.
"ching, two things are required in the
"Teacher. 1. Gifts from God. 2. Au-
"thority from the Church. Whence I
would inferr 1. That consent or election
of the people, is not sufficient to

make a man a *Minister*, though well gifted; but *Authoritative* act of the *Church*, is to passe upon him, (that is) *Ordination* by the hands of the *Presbytery*, according to his then *principles*. 2. That he is much changed (from what he was) in the *Treatise of Schisme*; where he requires, no more to constitute a Minister, than *Gifts* of preaching, and the *peoples submitting to him*: If any shall say, The Dr. by, *Authority* of the Church, meant no more, but the *election* or *Consent* of the people of a Congregation: I would answer for him, I do not believe, that at that time he would or did *equivocate* with the world, but took it in the *Presbyterian* sense: though now he rejects their *Ordination*, by Bishop, or Presbytery, and hath renounced his own ordination, and is not this a great *alteration*, and a sign of much *inconstancy*?

§. 14. Having said very much in pleading the *Liberty* of private Christians, lest they should *forget* of it, and *presume* too far; he gives some *wholesome Presbyterian Cautions* to bound them in. First, pag. 48. "The end why God bestoweth his gifts on "any, is merely that within the bounds of "their

to their own callings (in which they are circumscribed, 1 Cor. 7. 17. &c.) they should use them to his glory, and the edification of his Church. This was then his judgment: but now he can allow men, of any calling, if gifted, to violate those bounds, set by God himself, and to be Preachers of the Gospel, in private cases: which some of the prime brethren of New England do reject as reprobate. Secondly, he required, That they do abuse the power of Christian liberty & freedom of conscience, cast away all brotherly charity, and cut themselves off from the communion of the Church; as Christ hath not purchased a liberty for us, to rend his body: they will prove it to be so much to be the duties of piety, which break the sacred bonds of charity. Divinely, peace, and like a true Presbyterian: To cut themselves off, from the communion of the Church (which is separation) is to rend the body of Christ; and what is that but Schism? which is so much declaimed against, in his book of Schisme: And what liberty his people take, and he allows, for separation from not ours, but any Church, is fully discoursed above: To separate from the

communion of the Church, is also affirmed to be a breach of sacred charity, which is plain denyed in the same book. But yet more Presbyterian Doctrine: "Men ought not, under a pre-
"tence of congregating themselves to
"serve God, separate from their brethren,
"neglecting the publick Assemblies, as
"was the manner of some, rebuked by
"the Apostle, Heb. 10. 25. There be pe-
"culiar blessings, and transcendent privi-
"ledges, annexed to publick Assemblies,
"which accompany not private men to
"their recesses, &c. yet this is ordinari-
rily done by most of the Independent way; and allowed, yea justified now by himself. That sense of the term Heb. 10. 25. of neglecting the publick Assemblies (as the manner of many is) is now, otherwise glossed, and taken for Apostacy from the Faith: Ob. Schism, p. 74. And the event hath sadly proved, that private recesses are not accompanyed with those peculiar blessings annexed to publick Assemblies, witness those errors, heresies, blasphemies, prophanesses, which have followed private meetings.

L 45. Another cause (and the third is) "As

"As the Ministry is also to be the Mini- p. 49.
"sters to have that regard, respect and
"obedience, which is due to their labours
"in that sacred calling: would we could
"not too frequently see, more puffed up
"with a conceit of their own gifts, into a
"contempt of the most learned and pious
"Pastors, those are spots in your Feasts
"of charity, &c. This is so plain and evidently true, as if he that writ it, carried the same in his hand. And he did in a manner prophesie, when he said, "Let us then who despise a faithful Mi-
"nister in publick, flatter themselves
"with hope of a blessing on their endeavors
"in private: Let them pretend what they
"will, they have not an equal respect unto
"all Gods Ordinances. No doubt he spake then of our Parochial Ministers, and Ministry, as an Ordinance of God; whom now he unministers, and despises both them and their Ordination, as we have heard above. *Videris ipse.*

It might be objected against the peo- §. 16.
ples liberty of private Assemblies; p. 52.
"That what seems to favour licentious
"Conventicles, which in all places the
"Laws have condemned, and the Lear-
"ned in all Ages have abhorred, as Se-
"minaries

p. 512.

p. 16.
p. 52.

hath

hath suffered [illegible] upon his own [illegible]
[illegible] Job's head [illegible]
[illegible] the flames? [illegible]
[illegible] shall it [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] such Conventicles. [illegible]
3. He shall affirm, [illegible]
[illegible] which, I hope, he will not
dare to do; nor can be able to prove,
if he do affirm it. What he performs
[illegible] this kind, is, (to plead for his
[illegible]) we have seen above; and to
how little satisfaction.

There are two other Objections, §. 17.
which he answers well, as his then opinion was; I shall dispatch them in a
word: [illegible]
"solves [illegible] and so [illegible]
"as [illegible]
"[illegible] Congregations.
This we have done sufficiently above, by
others and himself. What lies he to
it? "Offences will come, &c. but [illegible] p. 53.
"[illegible]
"[illegible]
"[illegible]

"the very constitution of any Church, by "confusion; or the flourishing of it, by ig- "norance: both which would certainly "follow such courses. This needs no explication, nor confirmation: only it will need a *Reply* from himself, since he hath *retracted* this *truth* by him here delivered, by a *contrary practise*. The next Objection is no lesse true, and really exemplified in the present Conventicles. "*This may be a means for* "*men to vent their own private fancies* "*unto others, to foment and cherish errours* "*in one another: to give false interpreta-* "*tions of the word, there being no way to* "*prevent it.* What saies he to this? "*For interpreting the word, I speak not,* "*but applying of it being rightly interpre-* "*ted: And for the rest, would to God,* "*the complaints were not true, of those* "*things, that have for divers years in* "*this Church, been done publickly, &c.* "*But to prevent this, the care rests on* "*them whose sedulous endeavour should* "*be, to reprove and convince false Do-* "*ctrine, &c.* That is, I suppose, the *Ministers*: This may do something in the *publick*, but what's this to men of *private meetings*, *separating* from the Church?

Church? They will not come to hear in publick; and he does not intend, that Ministers should attend those private meetings, that were to turn them into publick, as now they speak. How then shall we prevent their *boldness* in *interpreting* Scripture, or their *ignorance* and folly in *misapplying* it? If his answer is the most *weak* and *defective*; and how he will give a *better* in his *New way*, it rests upon him to consider, and give at his own leasure.

22. 9. 49

FINIS.

# ERRATA.

f. to r, yet, p. 65. l. 24. f. mind r. includs,
66. l. 22. r. exhorting one. p. 70. l. 10. f. or
p. 72. marg. r, p. 77. p. 85. l. 27. f. l. r. n, p.
l. 26. f. to r, so, p. 94. l. 7. *dele* of, p. 104. l.
f. erre r. ere, p. 110. l. 32. r. affert, *dele* to,
113. l. 27. r. *confessis*, p. 114. l. 29. r. *fuis*
~~affert, p. 213. l. 22. f. in r. his, p. 120. l.~~
affert r. ask, p. 133. l. 9. *dele* to. p. 141. l.
f. h r. is, p. 143. l. 5 f. world r. word. p. 158.
f. af. f. as properly, r. improperly. p. 159. l.
af. for his r. this, p. 167. l. 12. *dele* them. p. 1
l. 3. f. ye, r. the. p. 170. l. 31. af. for, r. fr
p. 172. l. 11. r. Congregations. p. 175. l. 3. r.
seem. p. 18. l. 16. f. former, r. finer. p. 18
less, put in, their. p. 192. l. 14. after of,
in, the.